

STANDING COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

(2001)

THIRTEENTH LOK SABHA

**MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE
(Department of Agricultural Research and Education)**

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (2001-2002)

NINETEENTH REPORT

SEAL

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

NEW DELHI

April, 2001/Chaitra, 1923 (Saka)

<CONTENTS>

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE.....	(iii)
PREFACE.....	(v)
PART I	
CHAPTER I	
Demands for Grants (2001-2002) of Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agricultural Research and Education)	1
PART II	
CHAPTER II	Recommendations/Observations
APPENDIX I	Minutes of the Seventh Sitting of the Committee Held on 28 th March, 2001
APPENDIX II	Minutes of the Tenth Sitting of the Committee Held on 11 th April, 2001

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE
FOR THE YEAR - 2001

Shri S.S. Palanimanickam - Chairman

MEMBERS

LOK SABHA

2. Shri Ram Tahal Chaudhari
3. Shri Shivraj Singh Chouhan
4. Shri Shamsheer Singh Dullu
5. Shri Ramdas Rupala Gavit
6. Shri Thawar Chand Gehlot
7. Shri Raghunath Jha
8. Shri Shivaji Vithalrao Kamble
9. Shri Abul Hasnat Khan
10. Shri Y.G. Mahajan
11. Shri Haribhau Shankar Mahale
12. Shri Savshibhai Makwana
13. Shri Jagannath Mallick
14. Shri M. Master Mathan
15. Shri Dalpat Singh Paraste
16. Shri Tarachand Shivaji Patel
17. Shri Prakash V. Patil
18. Shri Sharad Pawar
19. Smt. Rama Pilot
20. Shri G. Sukender Reddy
21. Shri N.R.K. Reddy
22. Shri Pyare Lal Sankhwar
23. Shri Adi Shankar
24. Shri Chhatrapal Singh
25. Shri Lakshman Singh
26. Shri Rampal Singh
27. Shri Tejveer Singh
28. Shri Zora Singh Mann
29. Shri Bhal Chandra Yadav
30. Shri Mahaboob Zahedi

RAJYA SABHA

31. Smt. Jamana Devi Barupal
32. Shri Khagen Das
- *33. Shri Devi Lal
34. Shri Oscar Fernandes
35. Shri H.K. Javare Gowda
36. Shri Korambayil Ahammed Haji
37. Shri Kailash Joshi
38. Shri Kanshi Ram
39. Dr. A.R. Kidwai
40. Shri R. Margabandu
41. Shri M. Rajashekara Murthy
42. Shri Yadlapati Venkata Rao
43. Shri Sharief-Ud-Din Shariq
44. Shri Devi Prasad Singh
45. Vacant

SECRETARIAT

- | | | | |
|----|---------------------------------|---|---------------------|
| 1. | Dr.(Smt.) Paramjeet Kaur Sandhu | - | Joint Secretary |
| 2. | Shri Raj Shekhar Sharma | - | Deputy Secretary |
| 3. | Shri K.L.Arora | - | Under Secretary |
| 4. | Shri Anil Kumar | - | Executive Assistant |

* Ceased to be a Member of the Committee owing to his demise on 6.4.2001

PREFACE

I, the Chairman, Standing Committee on Agriculture having been authorised by the Committee to submit the report on their behalf, present this Nineteenth Report on Demands for Grants of the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agricultural Research and Education) for the year 2001-2002.

2. The Standing Committee on Agriculture was constituted on 1st January, 2001. One of the functions of the Standing Committee as laid down in Rule 331E of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha is to consider the Demands for Grants of the concerned Ministries/Departments and make a report on the same to the Houses. The report shall not suggest anything of the nature of cut motions.

3. The Committee took evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Agricultural Research & Education on 28th March, 2001. The Committee wish to express their thanks to officers of the Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Agricultural Research and Education for placing before them, the material and information which they desired in connection with the examination of Demands for Grants of the Ministry for the year 2001-2002 and for giving evidence before the Committee.

4. The Committee considered and adopted the Report at their sitting held on 11th April, 2001.

New Delhi;
11th April, 2001
21 Chaitra, 1923 (Saka)

S.S.PALANIMANICKAM
Chairman,
Standing Committee on Agriculture

PART I

CHAPTER I

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS 2001-2002(DARE)

1.1 The Demands for Grants for Department of Agricultural Research & Education (DARE) of Ministry of Agriculture is incorporated as Demand No.2 in the Expenditure Budget. The Demand includes besides Secretariat expenditure of the Department, contribution to international bodies, payments of grants-in-aid to the Indian Council of Agricultural Research to enable it to meet the expenditure on the various research institutes controlled by it and for its several research projects, schemes and activities. Payment of net proceeds of cess under the Agricultural Produce Cess Act, 1940 is also provided for in the Demand.

1.2 The entire demand of DARE comes under Revenue Section amount to Rs.1389.05 crore for the year 2001-2002. This Demand is divided into three major heads as follows:

Major Head “3451” includes outlay of Plan & Non-Plan expenditure on Secretariat of DARE under Sub-Head—Salaries, Overtime Allowance, Domestic Travel Expenses, Foreign Travel Expenses and Office Expenses.

Major Head “2415” includes outlay of Plan and Non-Plan payments to ICAR towards Agricultural Research and Education on Crop Husbandry, Soil and Water Conservation, Animal Husbandry, Dairy Development, Fisheries, Forestry and contributions to Commonwealth Agricultural Bureau (CAB), Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), Asia- Pacific

Association of Agricultural Research Institution (APAARI) and Network of Agricultural Centres for Asia and the Pacific (NACA), Regional Co-ordination Centre for Research & Development of CGPRT, International Seed Testing Association etc.

Major Head “2552”*

includes outlay of plan expenditure towards lump sum provision for projects/schemes for the benefit of North-Eastern Region and Sikkim.

Growth of Financial Outlay of DARE/ICAR

1.3 The Department of Agricultural Research and Education (DARE) was established in the Ministry of Agriculture in December, 1973 and started functioning from IV Five Year Plan. Budgetary allocations (Plan Outlays) made in respect of the Department, the total Plan Outlay of the Central Government and the total Plan Outlay of the DARE compared with the total Central Plan Outlay of the Government and percentage of DARE/ICAR total covering the period from IV Plan to IX Five Year Plan are given in the table below.

Growth of Financial Outlay of DARE from IV Plan to IX Five Year Plan

Sl. No.		IV Plan (1969-74)	V Plan (1974-78)	VI Plan (1980-85)	VII Plan (1985-90)	VIII Plan (1992-97)	IX Plan (1997-2002)
(1)	Plan Outlay for DARE/ ICAR (Rs. in crore)	85.00	153.56	340.00	425.00	1300.00	2635.22
(2)	Total Plan Outlay of Govt. (Rs. in crore)	15902.00	39322.00	97500.00	180000.00	434100.00	492221.00

(3)	Per Cent DARE/ ICAR of Total Plan Outlay	0.535	0.391	0.349	0.236	0.299	0.535
-----	--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

* The Major Head 2552 has been incorporated in Demand No.2 of the Expenditure Budget Vol. I, M/o. Finance from BE(2000-2001).

1.4. Rs.2635.22 crore includes Rs.2100 crore as IX Plan Outlay + Rs.400 crore as one time catch up grant. The percentage of DARE/ICAR of Total Central Plan Outlay for the IXth Plan will actually be Rs.2100 crore of Rs.492221.00 crore i.e., 0.43% approx.

1.5. The percentage growth of Plan Outlay of DARE/ICAR to the Central Plan Outlay during each year of the 9th Plan (1997-2002) is as under:

Year	Plan Budget of Govt. of India (Central Sector)	Plan Budget of DARE/ICAR (Central Sector)			
		Budget Estimate	%age	Revised Estimate	% age
1997-1998	91838.71	331.17	0.36	331.17	0.36
1998-1999	105187.16	531.17	0.50	445.00	0.42
1999-2000	103520.93	573.50	0.55	504.00	0.49
2000-2001	117333.80	629.55	0.54	550.00	0.47
2001-2002	130181.34	684.00	0.53	684.00	-
Total of Five Years	548061.90	2749.39	0.50	2514.17	0.46
IX Five Year Plan (1997-2002)	489361.00	3376.95	0.69	2514.17	0.51

The projections plan budget of Government and Budget Estimates and Revised Estimates of DARE/ICAR indicate that very small fraction of Government Budget has been provided ranging from 0.36 to 0.55 percent in Budget Estimate which has further declined in Budget Estimate to only 0.36 to 0.47 percent at RE due to Government's financial constraints.

1.6. For the IXth Plan the Committee noted that although the Planning Commission has initially approved an outlay of Rs.2635.22 crore which was further revised to Rs.3376.95 crore for DARE/ICAR, for the entire IX Five Year Plan, yet it has allocated only Rs.2749.39 crore as BE in five years which have been further reduced to Rs.2514.17 crore at RE stage. Rs.684.00 crore (BE) has been taken as RE for 2001-2002.

Growth of Total Allocations of DARE/ICAR to Agricultural GDP

1.7 The total allocation to the Department of Agricultural Research and Education for the year 2001-2002 is Rs.1389.05 crore. The Department was asked to furnish details of total allocations proposed and actually made/allocated since 1994-95 onwards vis-à-vis the percentage of these allocations with reference to the Agricultural GDP. In reply, the Department furnished the following table :-

(Rs.in Crore)							
Year	Plan		Non-Plan		Total Allocation	Agriculture GDP	As % age of DARE allocation w.r.t. Ag. GDP at Current Prices
	Amount Proposed	Amount Allocated	Amount Proposed	Amount Allocated			
1994-1995	336.67	275.00	202.00	202.00	477.00	255193*	0.19
1995-1996	383.50	310.00	238.86	238.86	548.86	277846*	0.20
1996-1997	440.34	289.30	244.08	244.08	533.38	334029*	0.16
1997-1998	1000.00	331.17	268.10	268.10	599.27	352753*	0.17
1998-1999	531.17	531.17	475.02	475.02	1006.19	428680*	0.23
1999-2000	712.68	573.50	768.47	638.44	1406.91	**	
2000-2001	1082.59	629.55	864.36	775.00	1404.55	**	
2001-2002	1497.90	684.00	705.05	705.05	1389.05	**	

* Agriculture GDP at current prices, Figures includes provisional estimate for 1997-98 and Quick estimate for 1998-1999, Source : RBI 2000 – Handbook of Statistical on Indian Economy

** Agricultural GDP figures for these years are not available in documented form

1.8 To a point regarding the percentage of increase/decrease of Plan and Non-Plan allocations made for 2001-2002 over the year 2000-2001 in real monetary terms, the Department forwarded the following statement :

(Rs. in crore)

	B.E. 2000-2001	R.E. 2000-2001	B.E. 2001-2002	Percentage increase/decrease during 2001-2002 over RE 2000-01

Plan	629.55	550.00	684.00	24.10 (increase)
Non-Plan	770.29*	770.33*	700.30*	9.09 (decrease)

* including Rs.5.00 crores (B.E.2000-2001), Rs.9.60 crores (R.E. 2000-2001) and Rs.40.00 crores (B.E. 2001-2002) for A.P. Cess funds.

Plan

It appears that there is increase in outlay upto 24% during 2001-02. However in real terms, the plan allocation approved is only 45.6% of the projected demand of Rs.1497.90 crore (which was left out of the approved IX Plan allocation of Rs.3376.95 crore for the terminal year of IX Plan i.e. 2001-02).

Non-Plan

The decrease is due to the fact that Rs.165.00 crores were provided in the B.E./R.E. 2000-01 for payment of arrears of SAUs staff consequent on implementation of UGC pay scales which is not required during 2001-02. If, we take this fact into account, then there is net increase of Rs.94.97 crores during 2001-02 over R.E. 2000-01.

Examination of columns' of " Plan" and "Non-Plan" allocation from 1994-95 onwards in the table under para 1.7 above reveals that there is an increase in the allocations in subsequent years. However, the increase in allocation in real terms is only marginal. The percentage outlay on Agricultural Research to Total Agriculture GDP ranges from 0.16% in 1996-97 to 0.23% in the year 1998-99.

Allocation to Agricultural Research In India vis-à-vis other Nations

A comparison of the allocation to agricultural research in India and various parts of the world is given in the table below :

Agricultural Research Intensity Ratio

(percentage) during 1991-1997

Developing Countries	0.50
Sub-Saharan Africa	0.70
China	0.36
Asia and Pacific	0.55
Latin America	0.54
West Asia and North Africa	0.52*
Developed countries	2.39
Global Total	0.81

* Extrapolated data
Source: Pardey et al. (1997)

Agricultural spending related to Agricultural GDP estimated at 0.23% in India is much less than the average world (global) spending of 0.81%. In most of the regions spending in agricultural research is higher than India.

1.9 The Committee while examining the Demands for Grants in respect of DARE for the year 1996-97, 1997-98, 1998-99 and 1999-2000 had in their 2nd, 10th, 8th and 19th Reports respectively strongly recommended for enhanced allocations to DARE/ICAR for the IXth Plan to a level of 1% of Agricultural Gross Domestic Product (AGDP) with a tendency to increase it gradually to touch 2% of Agricultural GDP. Likewise, in their 17th Report on Demands for Grants 2000-2001, the Committee stated :

“The Committee, therefore, once again strongly recommend for increasing the plan outlay for DARE/ICAR to the level of 1% of AGDP, to attain the objective of catching up with the productivity levels of the agriculturally and economically developed countries of the world as well as to double the foodgrain production of the country in 10 years.”

Sector –wise Demand Proposed Versus Demand Accepted (2001-2002)

1.10 The Comparative details of demand proposed (Plan & Non-Plan) by the Department to the Planning Commission and demand accepted by the Planning Commission for various sectors of the DARE/ICAR for the year 2001-2002 are as under :

(Rs. in crore)

Name of the Sector	Plan		Non- Plan	
	Proposed	Allocated	Proposed	Allocated
1. Crop Science	250.00	115.00	162.45	162.45
2. Horticulture	100.00	50.00	106.50	106.50
3. Natural Resource Management	100.00	60.00	65.97	65.97
4. Agricultural Engineering	50.90	25.00	63.35	63.35
5. Animal Science	75.00	60.00	20.74	20.74
6. Fisheries	70.20	30.00	50.50	50.50
7. Agricultural Eco. & Statistics	8.41	4.00	12.00	12.00
8. Agricultural Extension	127.00	90.00	*	*
9. Agricultural Education	200.00	80.00	3.90	174.89
10. Management and Information Services including new Initiatives & Pipeline Projects and DARE	71.39	10.00	174.89	
11. Mini Mission on Cotton Project	25.00	5.00	--	--
12. World Bank/ Externally Aided Projects	320.00	155.00	--	--
13. A.P. Cess Fund Act, 1940	-	-	40.00	40.00
GRAND TOTAL	1497.90	684.00	700.30	700.30

* The Agril.Extension are booked under Plan only. Hence there is no Non-Plan allocations.

Objective Classification -Total Allocations for DARE/ICAR during 2000-2001 and 2001-2002

Plan

1.11 The Sectoral details of ICAR and DARE, plan programme for BE and RE for 2000-2001 and BE for 2001-2002 are given below:

(Rs. in Crore)

Name of Division	Budget Estimate 2000-2001	Revised Estimate 2000-2001	Budget Estimate 2001-2002
1	2	3	4
RESEARCH			
Crop Science	104.70	95.47	115.00
Horticulture	49.00	42.81	50.00
Natural Resource Management	52.00	45.43	60.00
Agricultural Engineering	24.00	20.97	25.00
Animal Science	59.00	51.54	60.00
Fisheries	29.00	25.34	30.00
Agricultural Economics & Statistics	4.00	3.49	4.00
Agricultural Education	70.00	65.15	80.00
Agricultural Extension	60.00	58.42	90.00
Management and Information Services (including New Initiatives, Pipeline Projects and DARE)	24.85	7.71	10.00
World Bank Aided Projects/Externally Aided Projects	148.00	129.30	155.00
Mini Mission on Cotton-I	5.00	4.37	5.00
Grand Total	629.55	550.00	684.00*

* This includes Rs. 68.40 crore for North-East Region.

Non plan

1.12 The objective-wise break-up in respect of ICAR Non-Plan budget are indicated below:

(Rs. in Crore)

Sub-Heads	Budget Estimates 2000-2001	Revised Estimates 2000-2001	Budget Estimates 2001-2002
Estt. Charges (including OTA and Wages*)	701.76*	650.36*	585.26*
Travelling Allowances	3.99	3.99	3.99
Other Charges	38.39	71.38	45.46
Works	5.28	18.84	7.70
Other Items	15.87	16.16	17.89
Total	765.29	760.73	660.30
A.P. Cess Fund	5.00	9.60	40.00
Grand Total	770.29	770.23	700.30

Overall Review of Plan Allocation vis-à-vis Non-Plan Allocation during VIIIth Plan and IXth Plan

1.13 Details of total budgetary allocations, Plan Allocations, Non-Plan Allocations and their percentage out of the total budget from 1992-2002:

Sl. No.	Year	Total Budgetary Allocation	Plan Allocation		Non-plan Allocation	
			Amount	%age out of total	Amount	%age out of total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	1992-93 (BE)	375.65	200.00	53.24	175.65	46.76
2.	1993-94 (BE)	430.00	250.00	58.14	180.00	41.86
3.	1994-95 (BE)	477.00	275.00	57.65	202.00	42.35
4.	1995-96 (BE)	548.86	310.00	56.48	238.86	43.52
5.	1996-97 (BE)	533.38	289.30	54.24	244.08	45.76
6.	1997-98 (BE)	599.27	331.17	55.26	268.10	44.74
7.	1997-98 (RE)	683.70	329.38	48.18	354.32	51.82
8.	1998-99 (BE)	1006.19	531.17	52.79	475.02	47.21
9.	1998-99 (RE)	1095.95	445.00	44.24	560.94	55.76
10.	1999-2000 (BE)	1211.94	573.50	47.32	638.44	52.66
11.	1999-2000 (RE)	1304.00	504.00	38.66	800.00	61.34
12.	2000-2001 (BE)	1404.55	629.55	44.82	775.00	55.18
13.	2000-2001 (RE)	1325.00	550.00	41.50	775.00	58.49
14.	2001-200 (BE)	1389.05	684.00	49.24	705.05	50.75

Overall Review of Plan Expenditure during VIII Plan and IX plan

1.14 Details of Budget Estimates (BE)-Plan and Actual Expenditure (Plan) from 1992-93 onwards are as under:

(Rs. in Crores)

Sl. No.	Year	BE	Actual Expenditure
1.	1992-93	200.00	176.04
2.	1993-94	250.00	233.06
3.	1994-95	275.00	276.24
4.	1995-96	310.00	274.89
5.	1996-97	289.30	312.13
6.	1997-98	329.38*	331.14*
7.	1998-99	531.17	427.73
8.	1999-2000	573.50	498.47
9.	2000-2001	629.55	--
10.	2001-2002	684.00	**

* In this year's Statement No.2 (Summary) in Scrutiny of DFG (2001-2002) Document of the Department the BE 1997-98 has been changed to Rs.331.17 crore and Actual Expenditure 1997-98 changed to 323.30 crore.

** Figure of Actual Expenditure (2000-2001) are not yet available.

1.15 Budget Estimates (Plan) 2000-2001 were Rs.629.55 crore while the Revised Estimates (Plan) were brought down to Rs.550.00 crore. Nevertheless, the Anticipated Expenditure is Rs.790.33 crore which is Rs.160.78 crore more than the BE (Plan) and Rs.240.33 crore more than the RE (Plan). Budget Estimate (Plan) 2001-2002 is Rs.684.00 crores. The Committee enquired about the reasons for reducing the Plan Allocations by Rs.79.55 crores at RE stage. The Department in their reply stated as under :-

“The reduction in plan allocations of Rs.79.55 crores at RE during the current financial year (2000-2001) is due to financial constraints of the Government.”

1.16 When asked about the reasons for increase in the Anticipated Expenditure to the tune of Rs.160.78 crore in the Plan schemes over BE (Plan) in the year 2000-2001. The Department in their written reply stated :-

“Since most of the IX Plan schemes have been approved and their sanction issued, increased anticipated expenditure is to purchase approved equipments and also for providing funds for other non recurring contingencies to strengthen the research and educational programmes.”

1.17 When asked about the source of additional funding of Rs.160.78 crore for 2001-2002 (Plan), the Department in reply stated:

“Since there is no source of additional funding of Rs.160.78 crores, activities of many project/programmes may suffer in terms of infrastructural development for want of adequate funds both in current and next financial years.”

In this connection the Joint Secretary (Budget), Department of Agricultural Research and Education clarified during oral evidence that this is non-plan expenditure. ICAR has some internal expenditure, this comes under that .

Clarifying further on the same issue Secretary DARE stated :

“you are aware that in 1996 Revised pay scales were given to ICAR employees. The requirement in this was that whatever arrears are there, 80% are to be given to universities. This is excess in the salaries head”

On the same subject the Secretary further clarified

“No we did not get that amount. We projected that amount to the Planning Commission at the RE stage, but we did not get ...”

1.18 On a query regarding new schemes to be launched in 2001-2002, the Department stated as under:

“The launching of new schemes during the year (2001-2002) depends on the availability of funds and approval of the EFC proposals by the Expenditure Finance Committee/Standing Finance Committee for implementation.

The new schemes are

- 1). NRC Makhana.
- 2). NRC, Litchi.
- 3). NRC, Pomegranate
- 4). Technology Mission on Horticulture for NEH Region.
- 5). NRC on Pig.
- 6). Development and Strengthening of UG Education by Colleges of Agriculture affiliated to General Universities.
- 7). New KVKs (66 Nos).”

1.19 Budget Estimates as well as Revised Estimates (Non-Plan) 2000-2001 were Rs.775.00 crore. Budget Estimate (Non-Plan) 2001-2002 is Rs.705.05 crore. Thus, the decrease in Non-Plan 2001-2002 is visible by Rs.69.95 crore, if compared with Non-Plan BE/RE 2001-2002 which was Rs.705.05 crore. The Committee desired to know the justification for this decrease.

The Department in their reply stated :

“The Revised Estimates for 2000-2001 is Rs.775.00 crores for both DARE/ICAR out of which Council’s share is Rs.770.33 crore (including A.P. Cess of Rs.9.60 crores). The BE for 2001-2002 is Rs.705.05 crores for both DARE/ICAR in which Council’s share is Rs.700.30 crores (including A.P.Cess of Rs.40.00 crores).

In BE/RE 2000-2001 an amount of Rs.165.00 crores were provided for payment of arrears to the SAUs staff consequent on implementation of UGC pay-scales on the recommendation of Fifth Central Pay Commission which is not required to be paid during 2001-2002. Keeping in view this fact, there is net increase of Rs.94.97 crores over RE 2000-2001.”

1.20 The Committee also enquired about the details of (Head-wise) Anticipated Expenditure under Non-Plan 2000-2001 along with reasons for any variations from BE/RE (Non-Plan) 2000-2001. In their written reply the Department stated :

“ Head-wise anticipated expenditure under Non-Plan 2000-2001 and the amount provided under RE 2000-2001 is as under :

(Rupees in crores)

Sl.No	Sub-Head	Amount provided in RE 2000-2001	Anticipated Expenditure	Variation
1.	Estt. Charges (including Wages/ OTA/Pension etc.)	650.36	697.30	(+) 46.94
2.	TA	3.99	3.99	-
3.	Other charges including equipment	71.38	71.38	-
4.	Works	18.84	18.84	-
5.	Other Items	16.16	16.16	-
	TOTAL (1-5)	760.73	807.67	(+) 46.94
6.	A.P. Cess Funds	9.60	9.60	-
	GRAND TOTAL (1-6)	770.33	817.27	(+) 46.94

The excess anticipated expenditure over RE 2000-2001 will be met out from other resources of the Council (Revenue Receipts : Rs.19.06 crores; Interest earned on STD: Rs.16.88

crores and Recoveries of Loans and Advances: Rs. 11.00 crores) which Council is required to be utilized over and above the RE 2000-2001.”

One-Time-Catch up Grant

1.21 The Committee noted that the Department had been proposing an allocation of Rs.100.00 crore, Rs.200.00 crore and Rs.250.00 for the years 1998-99, 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 respectively towards the total one-time-catch up grant of Rs.500.00 crore considered essential for the modernisation of the decades old National Agricultural Research System as per the recommendation of the 9th Plan Working Group as well as repeated recommendations of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Agriculture in favour of this grant.

1.22 However, no funds were released towards this end till August 2000 by the Ministry of Finance and Planning Commission, nevertheless, the Department has been showing the proposed allocation towards one-time-catch up Grant in their Financial Statements relevant to the years mentioned above.

1.23 The Committee wanted to know the reasons for not proposing any allocation towards this Grant for the year 2001-2002 and also asked about the present status of the matter. The Department in their reply stated :

“For the preparation of Annual Plan Document of the Department for the year 2001-2002, the Planning Commission desires that requirement of different projects/programmes should include one time catch up grant and that no separate allocation will be made for catch up grant.

Since no separate catch up grant was available for different projects/programmes, all the different divisions were allowed to utilise 20% of catch up grant during 1999-2000 and

30% during 2000-2001. The remaining 50% will be allowed to be spent on catch up requirement depending of the fund availability with different institutions.”

Allocations for the Development of North-East

1.24 The Committee asked about the details of funds allocated, actually spent, shortfall, if any, and percentage of total plan allocation made for North East during the first four years of IX Five Year Plan; along with reasons for shortfall and whether the shortfall amount has been transferred to the Non-Lapsable Central Pool, year-wise. In their reply the Department stated as under :

(Rs.in crore)

Year*	BE	RE	10%	Allocation to NE States & Sikkim	Actual Expenditure	Shortfall
1998-1999	531.17	445.00	44.50	36.33	31.37 (70.49%)	13.13
1999-2000	573.50	504.00	50.40	53.80	37.52 (74.44%)	12.88
2000-2001	629.55	550.00	55.00	56.33	-	-
2001-2002	684.00	-	68.40	Under processing stage	-	-

* 10% funding criteria started with effect from the year 1998-99.

In so far as surrendering the shortfall amount to the Non-lapsable Central Pool of Resources is concerned, the department had written to the Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance that this shortfall may be adjusted by them (for contributing to central pool of resources) while communicating the funding at R.E. stage.”

1.25 The Lump sum provision for Projects/Schemes for the benefit of North-Eastern Region and Sikkim under the Major Head 2552 for the BE and RE 2000-2001 are as under :

	BE (2000-2001)	RE (2000-2001)	Shortfall
Lump sum Provision for NE Region	63.00	55.00	(-)8.00

1.26 The Committee asked about the reasons for reducing the NE Region Funds by Rs.8.00 crore at RE stage and the schemes which got affected owing to this reduction. They also asked about the possibility surrendering of this Rs.8.00 crore to Non-lapsable Central Pool. The Department in their reply stated :

“Rs.63 crore were allocated for N.E. region while the B.E. 2000-2001 was Rs.629.55 crore, but this had been reduced by the Ministry of Finance to Rs.550 crore at R.E. stage; accordingly, the 10% funding to the N.E. states amounts to Rs.55 crore i.e. it should not be taken as shortfall of Rs.8 crore. It may be added that the department has allocated more funds i.e. beyond 10% which are at Rs.55.97 crore and hope to utilize the same fully. The reduction of funds at R.E. stage were adjusted after re-prioritizing the requirement without cutting any scheme/projects. Due to the cut at R.E. stage, the 10% allocation for N.E. region itself stands at Rs.55 crore, so there was no need to surrender any fund to Non-lapsable Central Pool of Resources. As already indicated the department proposes to utilize more than 10% funds.”

100% funding for schemes in North East

1.27 The Committee had recommended and reiterated in their 19th Report (1998-99) and 7th Report (1999-2000) respectively that all the schemes planned for the NE Region by the Department should be 100% funded by the Union Government.

1.28 In their Action Taken reply to the 19th Report (1998-99) on DFG 1999-2000 (DARE), the Department in the month of July, 1999 had stated as under :

“The recommendations of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Agriculture that all the schemes planned for North-East States and Sikkim should be 100% funded by the Union Government is being forwarded to the Planning Commission and Ministry of

Finance for policy decision and for providing consequential budgetary increase in the current year budget.”

1.29 On the other hand, in their Action Taken reply to the 7th Report (1999-2000) on DFG 2000-2001 (DARE), the Department in the month of July 2000 had stated as under:

“All schemes of the Department were being implemented in the North Eastern States and Sikkim, are funded on 100% basis except the All India Coordinated Research Projects and their centres located in Assam Agricultural University.”

1.30 The Committee wanted to know exactly the policy decision taken during July, 1999 and July 2000 by the Ministry of Finance and Planning Commission with regard to 100% Central funding to North East Region and Sikkim and the consequential budgetary increase of the Department in the year 1999-2000. The Department replied as under :

“The Department from the very beginning provides 100% funds to all its schemes except AICRP centres irrespective of the location of the scheme. In case of AICRPs, the department has MoU on the basis of which the State Agricultural University centres are funded 75% by the department and the balance 25% by the respective State Governments. This mechanism is going on smoothly as on date.”

1.31 The Committee also asked about the reasons for not providing 100% funding to AICRPs and their Centres located in Assam Agricultural University. In reply the Department stated as under :

“For 100% funding of the Central Agricultural University, Imphal, the department has already submitted proposal to the Planning Commission for Rs.40 crore from Non-lapsable Central Pool of Resources. Apart from this the funding of 25 new KVKs worth

Rs.4.93 crore during IX Plan in N.E. region will also be pursued in the light of EFC decision on KVKs from Central Pool after clearance of EFC from Ministry of Finance.

As stated above, the department has MoU with State Agricultural Universities including Assam Agricultural University for sharing AICRP funding on the basis of 75% ICAR and 25% state and this mechanism is going on smoothly.”

10% to North Eastern States on Domestic Budgetary Support only

1.32 The Committee in their Second Action Taken report (1999-2000) have commented as under :

“The Committee may be apprised of the Government’s decision on the request of the Department to calculate 10% funding to North East States on Domestic Budgetary Support (DBS) and not on the total plan allocation.”

1.33 Again in their Seventh Report (1999-2000) on Demands for Grants (2000-2001) in Recommendation No.5, the Committee had again desired to be apprised of the decision of the Government of allocating 10% of allocation to North East States based on DBS only and not on DBS + EAP basis. The Department in their Action Taken Reply to the above mentioned Recommendation No.5 have stated that the Planning Commission and Ministry of Finance were approached by the Department at the level of HMA and HMOS level in this regard.

1.34 The Committee enquired about the present status of the matter and efforts made by the Department to get the decision from Planning Commission and Ministry of Finance regarding 10% allocation to North East States on DBS basis. The Department in their reply stated :

“The Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance have taken a stand that 10% funding to the N.E. Region is based on total funds allocated to the department and not based on Domestic Budgetary Support.”

Administration --Pending/Fresh Disciplinary/Vigilance Cases

1.35 The Committee in their Eighth Report (1998-99) on DFG (1998-99) pertaining to the Department in Recommendation No.7 had strongly recommended that immediate action should be taken by DARE/ ICAR to get the proposal for a separate vigilance cell headed by Director (Vigilance) sanctioned and speedy finalisation of all pending disciplinary cases within a reasonable time frame. Also to evolve a procedure to finalise fresh disciplinary cases within a stipulated time frame of maximum 2 years.

1.36 The Department in their Action Taken reply to the above mentioned recommendation had stated as follows :

“ Regarding finalisation of disciplinary cases within a stipulated time frame of maximum 2 years, the point has been noted for compliance and a procedure is being evolved to meet the deadline fixed”.

1.37 Similarly, the Committee once again in their Nineteenth Report (1998-99) on DFG 1999-2000 and Seventh Report (1999-2000) on DFG 2000-2001 (DARE) in Recommendation No.8 had strongly recommended for an independent vigilance cell headed by an officer not below the rank of a Director and all the pending cases should be finalized within a period of 2 years.

1.38 The Department in their Action Taken reply to the above mentioned Recommendation had stated in the month of July, 2000 as follows:

“At present 25 pending vigilance cases and 28 pending disciplinary cases are being processed in the Department. In pursuance of the PSCA, the creation of Post of Director (Vigilance) has been taken up by the Cadre Review Committee and a proposal **is being sent to Ministry of Finance for approval.**”

1.39 The Committee enquired about this newly evolved procedure and how it has helped in quicker disposal of pending Disciplinary/Vigilance cases since July, 1998. The Department furnished the following written information in this regard :

“The CVC had issued instructions / guidelines vide their Circular dated 3.3.99 laying down an elaborate model time limit for completing departmental inquiries. Besides, the CVC vide their circular dated 6.9.99 issued instructions for reducing delays in the Departmental inquiries. The above mentioned instructions issued by the CVC were circulated in the ICAR vide circular dated 10.3.2000 with the approval of the then Chief Vigilance Officer, for information, guidance and compliance to all the ICAR Institutes/ NRCs and all the Divisions at ICAR Hqrs. Subsequently, in a meeting chaired by the Director-General, ICAR with the CVO and the concerned officers on 29.5.2000 to review the status of pending vigilance / disciplinary cases, it was *inter-alia* decided that cases where the delinquent employee resorts to non-cooperation or dilatory tactics, ex-parte inquiry may be conducted as per the rules. In such cases the period in finalisation of inquiry should not exceed three months. Besides, it was also decided that in all cases where there have been delays in holding inquiries, a D.O. reminder may be issued at the level of DG, ICAR to all the Inquiry Officers (except those who are nominated by the CVC) to finalise the inquiry within three months as per the norms fixed by the Central Vigilance Commission. Accordingly, all possible efforts were made to finalise the pending disciplinary/ vigilance cases expeditiously by the Council. In addition to the above, the “Handbook on Disciplinary Matters” which was compiled and circulated to all in the ICAR in the year 1983, has also been got updated and its draft is under examination for finalisation and circulation to all concerned.

The abovesaid steps taken by the Council are aimed at eliminating delays in departmental inquiries. As per decision taken in the above mentioned meeting held on 29.5.2000 chaired by DG,ICAR, a D.O. reminder was issued to all departmental Inquiry Officers from the level of Chief Vigilance Officer, ICAR to expedite inquiries in terms of the said guidelines issued by the Central Vigilance Commission. Further, five out of the twenty five (25) pending vigilance cases and seven out of the twenty eight (28) pending disciplinary cases have also been finalised during this period.”

During oral evidence session, the Department further informed the Committee regarding their efforts in clearing pending Vigilance/Disciplinary cases during last one year as under :

“At the practical level, we have appointed two retired officers which are part of the CVC’s panel to take on the additional work of inquiry. The difficulty of the ICAR is that most of our personnel or scientists are not well conversant with the procedures of vigilance nor they are oriented towards this work. Therefore, to fortify the work that the ICAR can put in, two retired officers from the CVC panel have been selected and entrusted with this job. Therefore, we are able to show more progress than what was possible in the earlier years. In the last one year, five cases of vigilance have been disposed of. So we are left with the balance of 20 cases on the vigilance side and 21 cases on the disciplinary side. Apart from the step taken at the DG level, regular monthly meetings are being held at the level of CVO and monitoring of all these cases are being done regularly so that we can expedite and impress upon the Ios. In case they have any difficulty, we hope to solve it.”

When enquired about the nature of irregularity committed by the charged officials, the Department during oral evidence further clarified :

“They go abroad on one pretext or the other on fellowships, get employed and do not come back. They do not resign because then they have to pay for the training period which they have undergone earlier here. Therefore, they would like to keep the whole issue pending and the process is relatively longer in the sense you have to communicate to them, institute an inquiry and declare the office vacant as per the guidelines. That is why, it is taking time. Obviously, it is so when in the Council, we have 5500 scientists in place. We have to look in that context also. If you look at the overall personnel strength, the percentage of Vigilance cases is hardly 20 per cent.”

1.40 The Committee also enquired about the concrete efforts made by the Department after July 2000 for getting the post of Director (Vigilance) sanctioned by Ministry of Finance. The Department replied as under :

“A separate proposal has been mooted for creation of the post of Joint Secretary (Vigilance). This proposal is under active consideration.”

1.41 On a point of furnishing details of fresh Disciplinary/Vigilance cases initiated during 2000-2001 the Department stated :

“No new vigilance case has been initiated during 2000-2001. However, in eight cases charge sheets are likely to be issued on receipt of approval from CVC/disciplinary authority. Also, nine new disciplinary cases have been initiated during 2000-2001”.

Agricultural Scientists Recruitment Board (ASRB)

1.42 The Committee enquired about the sanctioned and actual strength of all the cadres in ASRB and reasons for shortfall, if any. The Department stated in their reply as under :

“The latest position of the functionaries can be seen below which indicates the vacant positions. ICAR headquarter is competent authority for sanctioning and posting of staff at ASRB. Board has been taking up this matter for filling up of vacancies with ICAR Headquarter from time to time.

The sanctioned and actual strength of all cadres of staff in ASRB :

Sl.No.	Name of the Post	No. of Sanctioned Posts	In Position
1	Chairman	1	1
2	Member	2	2
3	Secretary	1	-
4	Controller of Exam	1	1
5	Under Secretary	1	1
6	Special Assistant	1	1
7	AF & AO	1	1(Adhoc arrangement for half day)
8	Section officer	5	4
9	Technical Officer	1	4
10	T-5 (Hindi)	1	-

11	Private Secretary	2	-
12	S.P.A/Personal Assistant	6	4
13	Assistant	15	14
14	Upper Division Clerk	12	9
15	Lower Division Clerk	14	8
16	Hindi Stenographer(III)	1	-
17	Sr. Gest. Operator	1	1
18	Drivers	2	2
19	Daftri	2	2
20	Jamadar	3	1
21	Peon	8	7
22	Packer	1	1
23	Mali	1	1
	TOTAL	83	65

1.43 In this connection, the Committee enquired whether there was any procedure for dereserving the reserved vacancies in case there was a backlog in recruitment of reserved and OBC quotas or any problem in filling vacancies in remote areas or elsewhere inspite of repeated advertisements. In their reply the Department stated that, “There is no procedure for de-reservation of reserved vacancies. ASRB has conducted a special examination to fill the vacancies in remote areas. No such cases to go for repeated advertisements. Normally at the most by third attempt (that too in rare cases) vacancies are being filled.”

1.44 On a point about the existence of any standing or adhoc review Committee to look into the affairs of ASRB, the Department replied :

“One adhoc Committee under the Chairmanship of Shri C.Srinivasa Sastry, Ex-Secretary Department of Agriculture and Cooperation with 5 others as Members has been constituted to review the working of ASRB on 25th January, 1997. Most of the recommendations have been implemented and others are under final process for implementation.”

1.44(a) In this connection, the Committee enquired about the salient recommendations of the above Committee. In reply, the Secretary DARE during evidence stated as under :-

“They have said that there should be screening committees in place now. They have also suggested that simultaneously three boards should be held whenever positions are lower.

Earlier, it used to be one board for all the three members. For higher management positions, there should be a technical board. These have been accepted.

Similarly, they suggested that whatever vacancies are there, they should also be filled and some of the interviews should be held in different regions. They are holding interviews in different regions.”

Ambiguity in Budget Heads/Sectors depicted in Expenditure Budget vs other Budgetary Documents of the Department

1.45 The following ambiguity/variations of figures have been observed relating to Demands for Grants pertaining to the Department in various relevant budgetary documents containing financial statements as provided by the Department:

(Rs. in crore)

Sl. No	Demand No. 2 (Expenditure Budget Vol. II (2001-2002) Government of India)			Scrutiny of DFG (2001-2002) document (DARE)			Annual Plan (2001-2002) (DARE)	
	Sector	BE (2000-2001) (Plan)	BE (2001-2002) (Plan)	Sector	BE (2000-2001) (Plan)	BE (2001-2002) (Plan)	BE (2001-2002) (Plan)	BE (2001-2002) (Plan)
1.	2. Crop Husbandry	473.05	513.00	1. Crop Science	104.70	115.00	104.26	BE actual not given
2.	3. Soil & Water Conservation	2.90	3.58	2. Horticulture	49.00	50.00	49.00	
3.	4. Animal Husbandry	45.10	49.60	3. Natural Resource Management	52.00	60.00	52.00	
4.	5. Dairy Development	6.90	7.00	5. Animal Science	59.00	60.00	59.00	
5.	6. Fisheries	27.00	30.00	6. Fisheries	29.00	30.00	29.00	
6.	7. Forestry	11.00	11.82	10. Management and Information Service	24.85	10.00	25.59	

1.46 The Department was asked to give reasons for not having any uniformity in nomenclature of sectors given in Expenditure Budget (Demand No.2) of Government of India and the Scrutiny of Demands for Grants Document/Annual Plan Document of the Department. The Department in their reply stated as under :

“The expenditure budget for Demand No.2 for the Department of Agricultural Research and Education (DARE) has been proposed in the format prescribed by Ministry of Finance and the sectors shown in the Scrutiny of Demands for Grants documents has been shown as per Annual Plan document. The Committee in their 10th Report (1996-97) pointed out to make nomenclature of the sectors uniform in Annual Plan document as

well as in the Demands for Grants (Expenditure Budget). We have been trying to get these amended from Ministry of Finance/CGA since 1997, but we have not succeeded so far despite our best efforts. The current status is that we have again requested the CGA for amendment of these heads.”

1.47 The Committee have also observed the following ambiguity in the BE and RE Non-plan relating to 2000-01 and BE 2001-02 in the Expenditure Budget (2001-02); Vol.II Document and Scrutiny of DFG Document 2001-02:

(Rs. in crores)

Sl. No.	Expenditure Budget Vol.II (2001-02) Govt. of India (Demand No. 2)			Scrutiny of DFG Document (2001-02)		
	BE (2000-01) (Non-plan)	RE (2000-01) (Non-plan)	BE (2001-02) (Non-plan)	BE (2000-01) (Non-plan)	RE (2000-01) (Non-plan)	BE (2001-02) (Non-plan)
(1).	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1.	775.00	775.00	705.05	765.29	807.67	660.30

1.48 The Department was asked to give the reasons for difference in figures pertaining to Non-plan expenditure under columns 2, 3 and 4 compared with figures under Columns 5, 6 and 7 respectively mentioned above. In their reply the Department stated as under :

“It is a fact that BE/RE 2000-01 is Rs. 775.00 crores for DARE/ICAR out of which ICAR portion is Rs. 765.29 crores (excluding Rs. 5.00 crores of A.P. Cess) and the same has been shown in the Scrutiny of Demands for Grants Documents 2001-2002. Similarly in RE 2000-01, the Council’s portion under Non-Plan is Rs. 760.73 crores and under A.P. Cess Funds Rs. 9.60 crores, thus totaling to Rs. 770.33 crores. In the Scrutiny of Demands for Grants Documents 2001-02, the RE 2000-01 under Non-Plan has been shown as Rs. 807.67 crores, which is inclusive of other resources of the Council amounting to Rs. 46.94 crores i.e. Revenue Receipts : Rs. 19.06 crores; Interest earned on STD : Rs. 16.88 crores and Recoveries of Loans & Advances : Rs. 11.00 crores. Thus the Council’s portion of Govt. Grant Rs. 760.73 crores taken together with Council’s other

resources Rs. 46.94 crores works out to Rs.. 807.67 crores. In BE 2001-02, the amount allocated is Rs. 705.05 crores for both DARE/ICAR, out of which Council's portion is Rs. 660.30 crores under Non-Plan and Rs. 40.00 crores under A.P. Cess Funds.”

**Difference in financial figures in two Different Budgetary Documents of the
Department**

1.49 Major variations have been observed in financial figures relating to BE and RE (1999-2000); BE(2000-01) (plan) in Scrutiny of DFG Document (2000-01) and (2001-02) and also in Annual Plan Document (2001-02) as under :-

(Rs. in crores)							
Sl. No.	Sector	Scrutiny of DFG (2000-01)		Scrutiny of DFG (2001-02)	Scrutiny of DFG (2000-01)	Scrutiny of DFG (2001-02)	Annual Plan (2001-02)
		BE 1999-2000	RE 1999-2000	Approv. Outlay (1999-2000)	Appr. Outlay (2000-01)	BE (2000-2001)	BE (2000-2001)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.	Crop Sciennce	97.00	94.00	97.99	104.00	104.70	104.26
2.	Horticulture	47.00	41.00	42.07	49.00	49.00	49.00
3.	Natural Resource Management	50.00	45.00	44.95	52.00	52.00	52.00
4.	Agriculture Engg.	25.00	20.00	20.36	24.00	24.00	24.00
5.	Animal Science	54.00	48.00	45.00	59.00	59.00	59.00
6.	Fisheries	28.00	24.00	21.83	29.00	29.00	29.00
7.	Agricultural Eco.	4.00	3.10	2.91	4.00	4.00	4.00
8.	Agricultural Ext.	50.00	50.00	50.10	60.00	60.00	60.00
9.	Agricultural Education	55.00	64.00	65.10	70.00	70.00	70.00
10.	Mgmt. & Info. Services	38.50	14.90	11.39	25.55	24.85	25.29
	Total	448.50	404.00	401.70	476.55	476.55	476.55
11.	World Bank EAPs	125.00	100.00	102.30	148.00	148.00	148.00
	Grand Total	573.50	504.00	504.00	629.55	629.55	629.55

1.50 The Department was asked as to whether the terms Budget Estimates (BE) and Approved Outlay (AO) were the same and if these two terms were to be taken as same, then, reasons for the difference occurring in the figures under Column Nos. 3 & 5 showing figures for the same year in last year's Scrutiny of DFG Document and this year's Scrutiny of DFG Document. They were also asked to justify the difference in figures pertaining to Sl. No. 1 and

10 under column Nos. 6,7 and 8 pertaining to the year 2001-02 in Scrutiny Documents (2000-2001) and (2001-2002) and Annual Plan Document (2001-2002). To these points, the Department clarified as under :-

“The terminology Budget Estimates (B.E.) and Approved Outlay (A.O.) are the same. The column No.3 of the above statement pertains to original sector-wise approved outlay for 1999-2000 (B.E.) of Rs.573.50 crore; however, the outlays given in column No.5 pertain to R.E. (1999-2000) which was Rs.504 crore, hence, there is the difference among the sectoral distributions under these two columns – here it may also be mentioned that as per the Demands for Grants (DFG) document of 2001-2002 the heading given is “Approved Outlay, R.E.”, which in fact are the final R.E. figures for 1999-2000 only as finalized by the Department at the close of the financial year 1999-2000. Here it may also be added that the R.E. 1999-2000 figures given in column No.4 were those which were tentatively finalized well before the submission of Demands of Grants document 2000-2001 i.e. the finalized R.E. 1999-2000 figures could not be reflected in the DFG 2000-2001. To sum up, the department usually considers it appropriate to submit the latest possible figures of R.E./B.E, this is the real reason that there is difference between the R.E. 1999-2000 figures of column 4 &5.

The figures given in Column No.6 pertain to the original sectoral approved outlay (B.E.-2000 - 2001) at the start of the financial year 2000-2001. The figures of serial no.1 and 10 under columns 7 and 8 differ from figures in column 6 due to the reason that the Annual Plan 2001-2002 preparation exercise of the department starts mostly in the month of August/September, around that time the Department usually takes stock of its fund utilization process and in case of specific additional requirement the same is explored to be adjusted among the various sectoral distributions – as a result of in house discussion at the highest level in the department Rs.26

lakhs additional were provided to the Crop Science Division adjusting out of the Management & Information Services(MIS) sector, that is why the MIS sector is reduced by Rs.26 lakhs making it 25.29 crore (Rs.25.55-Rs.0.26=Rs.25.29 crore) and the figure under the sector of Crop Science was enhanced to Rs.104.26 crore during the year 2000-2001. As mentioned above, that the Annual Plan Document preparation exercise of the department begins around August/September, the further revised figures of Crop Science Division to Rs.104.70 crore (that is enhanced to Rs. 104.70 crore from the original Rs.104 crore) was a result of carrying out in house discussion after the finalization of draft Annual Plan document 2001-2002, on the basis of which the Crop Science Division was given Rs.104.70 crore against the original Approved Outlay 2000-2001 (Rs.104 crore), in fact this additionality was provided to the Crop Science Division for meeting its urgent and additional expenditure on account of holding of Indian Science Congress in January, 2001 – these changes were a result of in house discussion in the department and these changed figures were subject to adjustment at R.E. stage 2000-2001.

Here it may please be brought to the kind notice that the statement referred to above in the question does not contain the head Mini Mission on Cotton which in fact also figured in the Demands of Grants document 2001-2002 also”

Internal Resource Generation

1.51 The Department was asked to give details regarding targets fixed and achieved, shortfall reasons etc. for the Internal Resources Generation during the last five years. The Department stated :

“The target fixed and achieved for the Internal Resource Generation during the last five years are as under:

(Rupees in crores)

Year	Target fixed (B.E.)	Target achieved	Excess/ Shortfall
------	---------------------	-----------------	-------------------

1996-97	20.00	26.73	6.73 (+)
1997-98	41.66	22.90	18.76 (-)
1998-99	35.51	42.76	7.25 (+)
1999-00	36.94	38.82	1.88 (+)
2000-01	40.74	*	
2001-02	45.96	-	-

* The Annual accounts shall be finalized after 31st March 2001.

The revenue generation during the years 1996-97, 1998-99 and 1999-2000 was more than the fixed target. However, there has been shortfall in achieving the revenue target during the year 1997-98 which was mainly attributed by fixing higher target.”

Crop Husbandry Major Head 2415

Lower Growth in Crop Agriculture

1.52 The Committee observed that agriculture together with forestry and fisheries is expected to grow only by 0.9 per cent in 2000-2001 as compared to 0.7 per cent in 1999-2000 yet growth in crop agriculture (46 crops) is likely to show a 3.5 per cent decline because of lower foodgrains and oilseeds production. The Committee enquired into the reasons for very nominal increase of 0.2% only in agriculture together with forestry and fisheries sectors. The Department in their reply stated :

“It has been reported that agriculture together with forestry and fisheries expected to grow only by 0.9 per cent in 2000-2001 as compared to 0.7 per cent in 1999-2000 yet growth in crop Agriculture (46 crops) is likely to show a 3.5 per cent decline because of lower food grains and oil seed production.

The lower rainfall in 1999 may not have caused much decline in crop production due to residual moisture. However, deficient rainfall in 71 districts for the second year in succession in 2000 is bound to result in lowering this year's output in kharif foodgrains and oilseeds and possibly too in rabi 2000-01. Consequently, agriculture together with

forestry and fisheries is expected to grow only by 0.9 per cent in 2000-2001 as compared to 0.7 per cent in 1999-2000.”

1.53 As regards of reasons for lower foodgrains and oilseed production during 2000-2001, the Department stated :

“Food grains and oilseeds production in the country largely depends upon rainfall. A few States in the country were affected due to drought. Thereby affecting the oilseed and food production adversely.”

1.54 The Department was asked to furnish the Annual population growth rate vis-à-vis annual foodgrains production growth rate as well as annual growth rate of crop agriculture, fisheries, forestry, Animal Husbandry and Dairying, during the last one decade; year-wise. They have furnished the following table :

Base year 1990-91

Year	Annual Population growth rate	Annual Foodgrains production growth rate (Quantity)	Annual crop Agriculture growth rate (Value)	Annual Fisheries growth rate (Quantity)	Annual Forestry growth rate (Value)	Annual Animal Husban-dry growth rate (Value)	Annual Dairying growth rate (Value)
1991-92	1.89	-4.54	-2.58	8.37	-0.71	3.46	0.46
1992-93	1.86	6.59	5.21	5.00	-4.31	4.99	-1.50
1993-94	1.81	2.69	2.84	6.39	-2.34	5.32	4.94
1994-95	1.81	3.91	5.11	3.12	2.73	4.00	5.87
1995-96	1.90	-5.80	-1.43	3.34	-0.56	3.43	3.47
1996-97	1.67	10.53	9.70	8.06	1.40	3.51	3.99
1997-98	1.64	-3.56	-2.77	0.75	1.79	2.53	2.60
1998-99	1.62	5.82	7.36	-2.38	2.69	5.06	5.77
2000-01	1.57	2.65	1.97	7.41	0.55	4.28	1.45
2001-02(Projected)	1.57	0.73	3.18	6.12	1.41	3.85	4.62
CGR	1.8	2.2	3.1	4.1	0.6	4.0	3.5

Annual Growth Rate relates to change over the previous year

CGR : Compound growth rate for the decade

CROP SCIENCE

1.55 The following is financial data of Crop Science Sector which is directly responsible to cater to the R&D needs of foodgrains for the nation:

(Rs. in crores)

Sector	BE 2000-2001	RE 2000-2001	Anticipated Expenditure	Shortfall	BE 2001-2002
Crop Science	104.70	95.47	127.81		115.00

1.56 The Department was asked to give reasons for reducing funds by Rs.9.23 crore at RE stage during 2000-2001 and reasons for fixing BE . Rs.115.00 crore for 2001-2002 which is lower than the Anticipated Expenditure of Rs.127.81 crore during 2000-2001. In their reply the Department stated:

“The factual financial position is given as follows:

(Rs. in crores)

Sector	BE 2000-01	RE 2000-01	Anticipated Expenditure	Shortfall	BE 2001-02
Crop Science	104.70	100.84	100.84	3.86	115.00

The reduced availability of funds to the ICAR and in turn to the Crops Division is the reason for the shortfall.

As indicated above, BE 2001-02 of Rs. 115 crores is more than the RE/anticipated expenditure of Rs. 100.84 crores during 2000-01. However. the fact remains that less availability of funds to the Council and in turn to the Crops Division is the real cause for low BE for 2001-02 which is certainly less than the actual requirements.”

Plant Genetic Resources

1.57 The financial figures relating to two schemes under Plant Genetic Resources are as under:

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl. No	Scheme	BE 2000-2001	RE 2000- 2001	Anticipated Exp.	Shortfall/ Excess	%age Expenditure during 1 st 4 years of 9 th	BE 2001- 2002
--------	--------	-----------------	---------------------	---------------------	----------------------	---	---------------------

						Plan	
1.	National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources	350.00	250.00	480.40	(+)130.40	78.66	242.42
2.	NRC – DNA Finger printing	150.00	115.00	132.43	(-) 17.57	96.25	87.54

1.58 The Department was asked to give reasons for excess expenditure of Rs.130.40 lakhs over BE 2000-2001 and reasons for only 78.66% funds utilisation during first four years of IXth Plan under NBPGR. In their reply the Department stated :

“The factual financial statement is given below:

(Rs. in lakhs)							
Sr. No.	Scheme	BE 2000-01	RE 2000-01	Anticipated Expenditure	Shortfall/Excess	%age Expenditure during 1 st 4 years of 9 th Plan	BE 2001-02
1	National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources	350.00	250.00	250.00	(-)100.00	78.70	272.00
2.	NRC-DNA Finger printing	150.00	115.00	115.00	(-)35.00	96.25	87.54

The actual expenditure under Sl. 1 was Rs. 305.57 lakhs at the end of January, 2001. Scrutiny revealed that due to inadequacy of Non-Plan Budget grant, the Institute had perforce booked electricity charges under Plan. Steps were taken to ensure realistic allocation under Non-Plan RE and electricity charges were debited to Plan Budget of the Institute, were correctly booked under Non-Plan, thereby substantially reducing the expenditure under Plan. Keeping in view the likely expenditure during current financial year and total availability of funds to Crops Division RE 2000-01 was fixed at Rs. 250.00 lakhs.

Progress of expenditure is realistic keeping in view the actual fund availability.”

1.59 In regard to the rationale in keeping BE 2001-2002 at Rs.242.42 lakhs only which is Rs.107.58 lakhs less than BE 2000-2001 and Rs.237.98 lakh less than Anticipated Expenditure for the same year under NBPGR, the Department stated :

“The EFC of NBPGR which was sanctioned with a total outlay of Rs. 1500.00 lakhs is under revision to a proposed outlay of Rs. 1755.00 lakhs. Keeping in view the actual expenditure in first four years and the remaining programme for the fifth year. the BE 2001-02 has been fixed at Rs. 272.00 lakhs which is more than RE 2000-01.”

1.60 When asked about the reasons for shortfall of Rs.17.57 lakhs during 2000-2001 and rationale for fixing BE 2001-2002 at Rs.87.54 lakhs which happened to be Rs.62.46 lakhs less than the BE 2000-2001, the Department stated :

“The EFC was originally sanctioned for a total outlay for Rs 650 lakhs and is under revision for a total outlay for 836.34 lakhs and the allocation of RE 2000-01 is based on progress of expenditure.”

1.61 The Committee also enquired about the food items that have been / proposed to be undertaken for Genetic Modification alongwith the criterion for selecting the same for Genetic Modifications in India. In their reply the Department stated :

“In India. research is in progress in the area of Genetic Modification in rice mustard/Rapeseed, potato, tomato, brinjal, cauliflower, cabbage and sorghum.

The main reasons for selecting food crops presently for genetic modifications are to provide stability in productivity by incorporating biotic/abiotic stress tolerance and to enhance shelf life and to improve nutritional quality.”

Food Crops

1.62 The following are details of approved outlays, expenditure etc. for 2000-2001 and BE 2001-2002 of the various schemes under the food crops programme:

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl. No.	Scheme	Annual Plan Document BE 2000-2001	BE 2000-2001	RE 2000-2001	Anticipated Expenditure	Short- fall Excess over BE	%age Expenditure to 9 th Plan Outlay during first 4 years	BE 2001-2002
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1.	Indian Agricultural Research Institute	945.00	875.00	700.00	1080.65	(+)205.65	55.94	1380.02
2.	Central Rice Research Institute	500.00	500.00	235.00	500.00	Nil	42.37	483.00
3.	Indian Institute of Pulses Research	320.00	320.00	200.00	380.00	(+)60.00	55.48	280.88
4.	AICRP – Pulses (MULLARP)	275.00	275.34	350.00	315.00	(+)39.66	54.89	387.28
5.	Project Directorate – Wheat Research	511.02	511.02	451.00	509.00	(-)2.02	57.41	509.49
6.	Project Directorate – Rice Research	683.08	683.08	646.00	731.00	(+)47.92	66.00	545.10
7.	NRC – Sorghum	127.25	140.00	99.00	258.35	(+)118.35	36.58	238.99
8.	AICRP – Arid Legumes	75.00	75.00	88.97	93.00	(+)18.00	48.08	59.80
9.	AICRP – Pearl Millets	140.00	140.00	180.00	190.00	(+)50.00	57.91	195.82
10.	AICRP – Small Millets	100.00	100.00	142.00	150.00	(+)50.00	49.58	276.28

1.63 The Committee pointed out that the overall percentage of expenditure in just four years of 9th Plan is approximately 52% whereas the anticipated expenditure 2000-2001 in all the schemes mentioned above is positive i.e. over 100% and wanted to know the reasons and how it has affected the physical achievements. The Department in their reply stated as under :-

The factual financial statement is given below:

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sr. No.	Scheme	Annual Plan	BE 2000-01	RE 2000-01	Anticipated Expenditure	Shortfall/Excess over	%age Expendi-	BE 2001-02
---------	--------	-------------	------------	------------	-------------------------	-----------------------	---------------	------------

		Document BE 2000- 01				BE	ture during 1 st 4 years of 9 th Plan	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1.	Indian Agricultural Research Institute	945.00	945.00	700.00	700.00	(-)245.00	75.60	1380.00
2	Central Rice Research Institute	500.00	500.00	235.00	235.00	(-)265.00	61.18	483.00
3.	Indian Institute of Pulses Research	320.00	320.00	200.00	200.00	(-)120.00	63.60	280.88
4.	AICRP Pulses (Mullarp)	275.00	275.34	350.00	350.00	(+)74.66	59.51	387.28
5	Project Directorate- Wheat Research	511.02	511.02	451.00	451.00	(-)60.02	63.75	509.49
6.	Project Directorate- Rice Research	683.08	683.08	646.00	646.00	(-)37.08	75.10	545.10
7	NRC- Sorghum	127.25	140.00	99.00	99.00	(-)41.00	58.43	238.99
8.	AICRP Arid Legumes	75.00	75.00	88.97	88.97	(+)13.97	48.30	59.80
9	AICRP Pearl millet	140.00	140.00	180.00	180.00	(+)40.00	64.45	195.82
10	AICRP Small Millet	100.00	100.00	142.00	142.00	(+)42.00	56.70	276.28

- (i) The overall percentage of expenditure has been determined by the quantum of funds allocated to the SMD/Institutes. Physical achievements are commensurate to the flow of funds and status of necessary clearances from the Ministry of Finance for purchase of vehicles/creation of posts etc.. which were recommended by the EFC/SFC. The works and purchase of equipments were also subject to the availability/flow of funds.
- (ii) The sanction of the schemes with new provisions were made in the year 2000-01. Also, certain enhanced requirements on account of pay and allowances were essentially required to be addressed to. Consequently RE was more. These crops/commodities are also in the priority list of research.

(iii) The less availability of actual funds in each of the years was the reason for low percentage of utilization compared to the total allocation for the full plan period. However, 100% funds made available to the division were utilised.

1.64 In all the schemes under Food Crops mentioned above the Committee noticed that at RE stage allocations have been reduced considerably except for schemes at Sl.No.4, 9 and 10.

The Department was asked to give justification for the same in reply the Department stated :

“The EFC of IARI is yet to be cleared by Ministry of Finance. CRRRI and IIPR could not keep pace in expenditure mainly due to their low expenditure on works. In fact CPWD to which first instalment for laboratory construction for IIPR was paid in 1999-2000 have not yet started works. Hence, no subsequent payments could be made by IIPR to CPWD. In some of the cases where money was to be disbursed to other institutions viz. SAUs. Audit Utilization Certificates from some institutions could not be received. Hence as per rule no further disbursement could be made. Also lack of availability of actual funds was the reason in some of the cases for low expenditure.”

1.65 The Committee asked the Department to give reasons for fixing BE 2001-2002 lower than either BE or Anticipated Expenditure 2000-2001 for schemes at Sl.No.2,3,6,7 & 8 and fixing BE 2001-2002 higher than the BE or Anticipated Expenditure 2000-2001 for schemes at Sl.No.1 and 10 mentioned above. To these points, the Department stated :

“Except for Sl. No. 6 the BE 2001-02 is more than RE/actual expenditure 2000-01. In case of Sl. No. 6 the amount of BE 2001-02 has been determined by overall sanctioned outlay of 9th Plan and reduced over all availability of funds.

In case of Sl. 1. the pace of expenditure has picked up in the second half of 2000-01 and if flow of funds is maintained the Institute has the potential to effectively utilise allocated BE

2001-02 as EFC is likely to be cleared by Ministry of Finance shortly. Regarding Sr. No. 10 it is to mention that pay and allowances are to be paid more. Also sanctioned equipments are to be procured.”

Forage Crops

1.66 The details of BE, RE, Anticipated Expenditure 2000-2001 and BE 2001-2002 for two schemes under Forage Crops are as under:

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl. No.	Scheme	BE 2000-2001	RE 2000-01	Anticipated Expenditure 2000-01	BE 2001-2002	Annual Plan Document 2001-2002 BE
1.	Indian Grassland and Fodder Res. Instt.	155.00	165.00	255.00	155.00	155.00
2.	AICRP – Forage Crops	213.14	213.00	225.00	213.14	200.00

1.67 The Committee enquired about the reasons for increase in Anticipated Expenditure in each of the above schemes and the source from where the additional funds were provided along with the justification in fixing BE 2001-2002 lower than the Anticipated Expenditure. The Department in their reply stated :

“The factual financial statement is given below:

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sr. No.	Scheme	BE 2000-01	RE 2000-01	Anticipated Expenditure 2000-01	BE 2001-02	Annual Plan Document 2001-02 BE
1	Indian Grassland and Fodder Research Institute	155.00	165.00	165.00	155.00	155.00
2.	ACRIP on Forage crops	213.14	213.00	213.00	213.14	200.00

- (i) As shown above. the anticipated expenditure is equal to RE 2000-01. This is within the overall outlay of the schemes during IX Plan and within the total Plan funds made available to the SMD during the Current Financial year.

- (ii) The amount of BE 2001-02 has been determined by the total sanctioned outlay of the schemes for IX Plan.”

1.68 The Committee wanted to know about the state-wise account of area under Forage Crops, average yield, annual growth rate of animals/fauna dependent on forage crops, year-wise, during 9th plan. In reply, the Department stated as follows :-

“India has the largest livestock population and therefore. forage crops occupy an important place in Indian Agricultural Economy. These have added importance in the context of diversification of cropping system as well as farming systems; and sustainability. The total area under cultivated fodder in the country is around 8.3 m/ha. The present availability of green fodder from cultivated areas and pasture is about 573 million tonnes and that of dry fodder is about 523 million tonnes. States like Rajasthan (3100 thousand hectare), Gujarat (877 thousand hectare), Haryana (683 thousand hectare), Punjab (697 thousand hectare), Uttar Pradesh (861 thousand hectare) and Madhya Pradesh (876 thousand hectare) have larger acreage under cultivated fodder crops.

The average yield of forage crops(productivity) in different zones is as under:-

Northern Region	190 t/ha/year green fodder
Central West Region	210 t/ha/year green fodder
Eastern Region	115 t/ha/year green fodder
Southern Region	135 t/ha/year green fodder

The annual growth rate of animals is as below:-

Cattle	0.50%
Buffalo	2.50%
Goats	3.35%
Sheep	0.50% ”

1.69 The Committee wanted to know about the varieties developed by ICAR for the water scarce areas of Rajasthan, Gujarat and Orissa, where animal husbandry is suffering year after year because of fodder scarcity and whose economy mainly depends on livestock and the reasons these varieties are not grown by the people. The Department in their reply stated :

“The list of varieties developed by ICAR for water scarce areas of Rajasthan. Gujarat and Orissa is given below.

Drought resistant/tolerant varieties of forage crops suitable for cultivation in Rajasthan Gujarat and Orissa.

Crop	Varieties
Clusterbean	DP safed. FS 277. HFG 119. HFG 156. Bundel Guar 1. Bundel Guar 2
Pearl millet	Rajko. Raj Bajra Chari 2. Giant Bajra
Sorghum	SSG 59-3. MFSH-3. Guj Forage Sorghum 1. HC 136. Raj Chari 1 PC 6. PC 9. PC 23
Deenanath grass	Bundel Deenanath 1. Bundel Deenanath 2
Cowpea	Bundel Lobia 1. Bundel Lobia 2 EL 4216. UPC 287. UPC 5286, UPC 8705
Napier x Bajra	Co 1
Maize	African tall
Field Bean	Bundel sem-1. JLP-4

Many of the above varieties are in commercial cultivation with the farmers. However there is lot more of scope for popularization of these promising varieties by the developmental departments. The certified/quality seed production which is the responsibility of the central /state seed corporations/agencies is the major bottle-neck for low spread of improved varieties.”

Commercial Crops

1.70 The BE, RE, Anticipated Expenditure etc. for 2000-01 and BE 2001-02 for some schemes under Commercial Crops Programme are as under :

Schemes	(Rs. in lakh)				
	BE (2000-01)	RE	Anticipated Expenditure	%age Exp. 4 years of IX plan	BE (2001-02)
1. Central Tobacco Res. Instt.	85.00	85.00	165.00	37.10	194.68

2. Indian Instt. of Sugarcane	140.00	220.00	300.00	37.42	331.60
3. Central Instt. of Cotton Res.	130.00	130.00	350.00	36.84	290.72
4. AICRP-under-utilised and under-exploited plant	55.00	62.00	65.00	612.78*	34.10*

1.71 The Committee desired to know about the reasons for very steep increase in anticipated expenditure under schemes at Sl. No. 1.2 & 3 over BE 2000-2001. The Department in their reply furnished the following statement and stated :-

“ (Rs. in Lakh)

Sr. No.	Scheme	BE 2000-01	RE 2000-01	Anticipated Expenditure 2000-01	%age exp. 4 years of IX Plan	BE 2001-02
1.	Central Tobacco Research Institute	85.00	85.00	85.00	49.00	194.68
2.	Indian Institute of Sugarcane	140.00	220.00	220.00	55.44	331.60
3.	Central Institute of Cotton Research	130.00	130.00	130.00	52.31	290.72
4.	AICRP under utilized crops	55.00	62.00	62.00	70.20	65.00

In case of Sl. 1 and 3 as shown above anticipated expenditure is equal to RE 2000-01. As regards S.No. 2 the increase is due to construction of auditorium having materialised during the current financial year for which part payment had to be made. This is an approved item in the EFC. In general anticipated expenditure was projected with the hope that actual funds would be made available as per sanctioned provisions. In real terms it did not happen.”

1.72 Cotton crop is reported to have failed for third successive year in Andhra Pradesh and farmers in the Warangal and Karimnagar districts committed suicide. It has also been reported that total failure of cotton crop was due to unseasonal rains, long dry spells, consequent outbreak of pests attack and lack of quality seeds. All these causes for failure of the crop comes under abiotic and biotic stresses and to fight with these stresses in time is the mandatory task of DARE/ICAR. The Department was asked to state the concrete action plan envisaged to save the

cotton crop year after year and lives of thousands of farmers committing suicide. In their reply, the Department stated :

“The research on cotton has given significant results. India is the first country in the world to produce and commercialise Hybrid cotton. The production of cotton lint increased to 12.18 mb in 1998/99 as compared to 3.04 mb in 1950-51. However, the DARE/ ICAR is alive to the recent problems faced by cotton growers. New varieties, production and protection technologies have been developed by ICAR institutes in partnership with SAU’s. Integrated Pest Management (IPM) modules for management of cotton pests have been developed for the country. The farm worthiness of these modules are established . The technology available needs to be transferred vigorously by development agencies/departments to realise tangible results on the ground.”

1.73 The Committee observed the BE 2000-01 for Mini-Mission Cotton Project-I is Rs.5.00 crore while RE is Rs.0.00 crore. Rs.4.37 crore allocated for Mini-Mission Cotton Project is stated to be included under Crop Science allocation of Rs.99.84 crore. The Anticipated Expenditure under this project during 2000-01 is stated to be Rs.5.00 crore. Mini-Mission cotton project is an independent project the Department was asked to state as to why Rs.4.37 crore were included under Crop Science Sector and reasons for increase in Anticipated Expenditure. In this connection the Department in their reply stated as under :

“For Mini-Mission -I, a sum of Rs. 10.00 crores were to be provided by DAC, GOI in the year 1999-2000. However the same could be provided only in the second half of the financial year 2000-2001. Hence, these resources were effectively used for cotton Mini-Mission program. Accordingly, the provision of Rs. 5 crores made in the overall budget

allocation for DARE/ICAR was rationally used for the on-going programmes of different crops including cotton.”

1.74 The Committee wanted to know about the rationale for having AICRPs on Tobacco, Sugarcane and Cotton since already huge fundings are earmarked for Research on these three Commercial crops under the Central Institutes meant for the same crops, respectively. The Department in their reply stated :

“Central Institutes on Tobacco, Sugarcane, Cotton and Jute & Allied Fibres are mandated to conduct primarily basic and strategic research. The All India Coordinated Research Projects have the major responsibility to develop region/location-specific technologies, capitalizing on the research strength at the national level.”

Oil Seeds

1.75 There are nine major oilseeds namely groundnut, rapeseed/mustard, soyabean, castorseed, seasmum, nigerseed, sunflower, linseed and safflower. Oilseeds are produced both during kharif and rabi seasons. The decline in output of oilseeds has continued for the second successive year. The current year’s oilseed output at 18.6 million tonnes is lower by 2.3 million tonnes compared to 20.9 mt. achieved in 1999-2000. Soyabean output would be lower by 1.6 mt. compared to 6.8 mt. achieved last year. Rapeseed/mustard output also would be lower by 1.7 mt. to reach 4.3 mt. compared to last year’s output of 6 mt.

1.76 The Committee observed the BE. RE and Anticipated Expenditure for 2000-01 and BE 2001-02 as given in the Financial Statement of the Deptt. for schemes under oilseeds programme as under :

(Rs. in lakhs)							
Sl. No	Scheme	BE (2000-01)	RE	Shortfall	Anticipated Exp. As in Annual Plan Document	%age Exp. To IX Plan outlay	Annual outlay (2001-02)
		3			6	7	

1	2		4	5			8
1	NRC-Groundnut	125.00	105.00	35.00	125.00	63.67	108.61
2	NRC-Soyabean	135.00	100.00	100.00	95.00	73.78	121.08
3	NRC-Rapeseed & Mustard	300.00	200.00	0.00	275.00	89.66	96.32
4	PD-Oilseeds Res.	370.00*	370.00*	(-)7.00	429.99	84.05	320.54
5	AICRP-Linseed	93.00	100.00	-	105.00	-	61.92
6	AICRP-seasame and niger	122.00	116.00	-	122.00	-	83.52
7	AICRP-Groundnut	156.68	209.00	(-) 9.93	180.00	76.16	152.64
8	AICRP-Rapeseed Mustard	218.07	228.00	(-) 2.80	200.00	62.13	149.68
9	AICRP Soyabean	101.20	104.00	88.95	120.00	385.00	88.28

1.77 The Committee enquired about the reasons for shortfall in case of Sl.No.1,2 and 3 in the above table. The Department in reply explained :

The less availability of actual funds was the reason for shortfall in case of Sl. no. 1 & 2. In case of Sl. no. 3. need arose for a revised EFC. Now. EFC has cleared the proposal and CPWD has undertaken the job for which next payment would be due very early in the financial year 2001-02.

The factual statements are as follows :

(Rs. in lakhs)							
Sl. No.	Scheme	BE (2000-01)	RE	Shortfall	Anticipated Exp. as in Annual Plan Document	%age Exp. to IX Plan outlay	Annual outlay (2001-02)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.	NRC-Groundnut	125.00	105.00	20.00	105.00	64.39	108.61
2.	NRC-Soyabean	135.00	100.00	35.00	100.00	56.90	121.08
3.	NRC- Rapeseed & Mustard	300.00	200.00	100.00	200.00	74.22	96.32
4.	PD- Oilseeds Research	370.00	370.00	-	370.00	71.05	320.54
5.	AICRP-Linseed	93.00	100.00	-	100.00	73.82	61.92
6.	AICRP-Sesame & Niger	122.00	116.00	6.00	116.00	76.35	83.52
7.	AICRP Groundnut	156.68	209.00	-	209.00	79.76	152.64
8.	AICRP-Rapeseed & Mustard	218.07	228.00	-	228.00	80.74	149.68
9.	AICRP-Soybean	101.20	104.00	-	104.00	81.97	88.28

1.78 The Committee asked the Department to state as to why despite of having IX Plan outlay of Rs. 552.60 lakhs for AICRP-Linseed and Rs. 664.83 lakhs for AICRP-Seasame and Niger no expenditure could be incurred during first three years of IX Plan for these two schemes. The Department in their reply stated :

“In the first 3 years during IX Plan period the AICRP (Linseed) and AICRP (Sesame and Niger) were part of Directorate of Oilseed Research (DOR) Hyderabad and funds were therefore shown under DOR. After the approval of separate EFC these two projects have now been delinked from DOR and separate provision for funds have been made. Therefore, no expenditure was shown against these two projects separately during the first 3 years.”

1.79 When asked about the reason, that necessitated the increase in expenditure over BE under schemes at Sl. No. 4 & 9 mentioned above, the Department clarified:

“The increased expenditure under pay and allowances necessitated increase in expenditure over BE.”

1.80 The Committee wanted to know the reasons for decline in oilseeds production for last two years and the concrete measures taken by the Department to counter declining trend in oilseeds production. i.e. from 24.7 mt. in 1998-99 to 18.6 mt. in 2000-01. The Department in their reply stated :

“The decline in the oilseed production has been mainly due to drought which has affected last year's groundnut and soybean crops and this year's soybean and rapeseed-mustard crops. The year-wise and crop-wise details are as follows:

Crop-wise production of oilseed crops during 1998-99 and 1999-2000

Crop	(million tones)	
	1998-99	1999-2000
Groundnut	8.98	5.31
Rapeseed & Mustard	5.67	5.96
Soybean	7.14	6.79
Sunflower	0.94	0.81
Sesame	0.53	0.52
Linseed	0.26	0.28
Safflower	0.24	0.27
Niger	0.14	0.15
Castor	0.84	0.77
TOTAL	24.75	20.87

Research is under progress to identify drought tolerant varieties of oilseed crops. The technology with respect to optimum use of available water through sprinkler irrigation has already been recommended to economise the available water resources. Efforts are also under way to develop short duration varieties of soybean and groundnut which can escape the terminal drought of the season.

In order to exploit heterosis, hybrids have been developed in sunflower and castor. For the first time hybrids of safflower have been developed and recommended for commercial cultivation. A number of varieties of oilseed crops with built-in resistance to important diseases have been developed. Integrated Pest Management modules have been developed for pest control. Front line demonstration are being conducted on farmers' fields to demonstrate the impact of improved technology in raising production and productivity of oilseed crops.”

1.81 The Committee noted that bulk of shortfall in oilseeds output is reported to be due to large decline in groundnut production. The anticipated expenditure is Rs. 180.00 lakh against the BE of Rs.156.68 lakh under AICRP-Groundnut and Rs. 125.00 lakh under NRC-Groundnut for the year 2000-01 and therefore wanted to know the reasons for this lackadaisical approach towards this important oilseed crop and the reasons for not showing any work done for the Groundnut research during 2000-01 and to be done in 2001-02 in the Performance Budget. To these points, the Department replied as under :

“The factual position regarding anticipated expenditure under AICRP(Groundnut) is Rs.209.00 lakhs against the BE of Rs.156.68 lakhs. For NRC-Groundnut, against BE 2000-01 of Rs.125.00 lakhs the anticipated expenditure is Rs.105.00 lakhs.

During the year 2000-01 the research work for improvement of groundnut was undertaken through the National Research Centre on Groundnut, Junagadh and the All India Coordinated Research Project on Groundnut. Two new varieties namely LGN-2 and GG 6 were released for the states of Maharashtra and Gujarat respectively. In addition a number of promising lines having resistance to important diseases were tested in the advanced level trials. Twenty six isolates of *Trichoderma* spp were characterised for various desirable traits for use in management of *Aspergillus flavus* the causal agent of aflatoxin contamination. A total of 249 frontline demonstrations were conducted under farmers' fields conditions in different States to demonstrate the impact of improved technology such as new varieties, IPM modules and other package of production.”

Hybrid Research

1.82 The Committee observed that nine crops viz. rice, maize, sorghum, pearl millet, cotton sunflower, castor, rapeseed/mustard and pigeonpea have been included in National Agriculture Technology (NATP) Project as a Mission Mode Project. Intensification of hybrid research is intended to manifest the potentialities of exploiting heterosis of these nine crops and wanted to know the criteria of selecting these crops under NATP as a Mission Mode Project (MMP) and the number of crops that have been selected so far as MMP under NATP. In their reply, the Department stated:

“Nine Crops namely rice, sorghum, maize, pearl millet, cotton, sunflower, castor, rapeseed-mustard and pigeonpea were selected for Mission Mode Programme under NATP as the ICAR had potential for hybrid technology in all these crops. It is well recognized that exploitation of heterosis in crops having hybrid technology could be used to achieve significant increase in productivity. Among these crops it is notable that

hybrid technology was developed for the first time in India in grain pearl millet, cotton, castor and pigeonpea.”

1.83 The Committee desired to know reasons for not including major pulses and Groundnut which need high priority intensification of hybrid research and immunization from abiotic and biotic stresses, in NATP as MMP alongwith reasons for the same. The Department stated in their reply:

“Pulses except pigeonpea and groundnut are not included in NATP hybrid Mission Mode Project. However research intensification in groundnut and major pulses is being undertaken under NATP outside the Mission Mode Programme with emphasis on productivity and building resistance to abiotic and biotic stresses.

Groundnut and major pulse crops other than pigeonpea were not included in NATP as Mission Mode Programme because hybrid technology was not available in these crops. The potential for exploitation of hybrid vigour also does not appear in near future in groundnut and other major pulses including chickpea. field pea. lentil urdbean and mungbean.”

Biotechnology for Crop Improvement

1.84 The BE, RE, Shortfall, Anticipated Expenditure. etc. for 2000-01 and BE 2001-02 under the scheme-NRC-Biotechnology Centre for Crop Science are given as under :-

(Rs. in lakhs)

Scheme	BE (2000-01)	RE	Shortfall to RE	Anticipated Exp.	%age Exp. to IX Plan outlay	BE (2001-02)
NRC-Biotechnology Centre for Crop Science	140.00	100.00	40.00	140.00	51.43	171.93

In this connection, the Committee wanted to know as to how the mandate of NRC-Biotechnology is different from the mandate of (i) National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources, and (ii) NRC-DNA Fingerprinting of ICAR.

The mandates of NRC on DNA fingerprinting and NBPGR are different from that of NRC on Plant Biotechnology. In brief NBPGR is mandated to collect evaluate maintain and exchange germplasm at national and international level whereas NRC on DNA fingerprinting is mandated to biodiversity-related services like developing molecular markers for DNA profiling. DNA fingerprinting of released/notified varieties. DUS testing of varieties etc.”

The Committee also enquired about the reasons for utilising only 51.43% of total allocations during first four years of IX Plan under NRC-Biotechnology Centre. In reply, the Department stated as follows :

“The factual financial statement is given below:

Sr. No.	Scheme	BE 2000-01	RE	Shortfall to RE	Anticipated Expenditure	%age Expenditure 9 th Plan Outlay	BE 2001-02
1.	NRC-Biotechnology Centre for Crop Science	140.00	135.00	5.00	135.00	73.00	171.93

Thus. the actual utilization for the first four years is 73% as indicated above.”

The Committee wanted to know whether NRC- Biotechnology Centre for Crop Science was competent enough to dislodge the challenges/threats. posed to Indian farmers. particularly in the era after the removal of Quantitative Restrictions (QRs) on the import of about 147 agricultural Commodities by the Government owing to WTO agreement from April. 2000 and total removal on remaining 714 items by Ist of April. 2001. The Department stated as under :

“The WTO addresses many issues. Hence, the NRC on Plant Biotechnology with very specific mandate could cater only to the requirements of its area jurisdiction of its operation.”

The Committee also desired to know about any action plan envisaged by the Department to gain the required competence in the field of providing biotechnological support to Indian farmers enabling them to produce better than the best. quality-wise as well as cost -wise to withstand the forced freedom of agrarian imports. To this point, the Department stated :

“The NRC on Plant Biotechnology is a small institute with few scientists and limited infrastructure facilities. Biotechnology is indeed an extremely powerful tool. This requires considerable investment with a long gestation period. Also initial investments are far more desired. Similarly first rate human resources in the frontier areas of biotechnology would be essentially required to compete internationally rather effectively.”

HORTICULTURE

1.85 The Committee noted that in 1997 ICAR/IARI had developed a low cost zero Energy Cool Chambers to help the farmers and country to minimize the post-harvest losses for Horticultural commodities and wanted to know whether any monitoring has been done by the Department to measure the impact of adoption of this technology for commercialisation. The Department in their reply stated :

“National Horticulture Board provides 100% grant of Rs. 2500 for demonstration of each zero energy cool chamber per school/village in a panchayat. During the Kisan Mela at IARI farmers have shown keen interest in adopting to this technology”.

1.86 In this connection the Committee wanted to know about adoption level of the technology, state wise-cum-number of farmers-wise who have adopted this technology and got benefited by it and also about the percentage of post harvest losses of horticultural crops brought down by this technology during the last 3 years along with the details of any further development in this technology. To these points, the Department stated as follows :

“Different variation of this technology are being tried out. The work is under progress.”

1.87 To another query about the other latest research in Post Harvest Technology, the Department stated :

“ Information on the latest research in post harvest technology is as under:

1. Development of package line for Nagpur mandarin.
2. Ventilated CFB packing for mango. citrus. apple etc.
3. Sea transportation of mango for export
4. Long Distance transportation practice for banana
5. Improvised implements such as mango harvester. fruit peeler. cassava-chipping machine. raw mango processing machine, and solar drier for dehydration of fruit and vegetables have been developed.
6. Utilization of indigenous fruits for health drinks”

Paddy Processing Centre-Thanjavur

1.88 The Committee noted that in the Action Taken reply to the Recommendation Sl. NO. 12 of Seventh Report (1999-2000) regarding upgrading and taking over of the Paddy Processing Research Centre at Thanjavur, the Department had stated that they are taking a final decision in this regard. The Committee wanted to know the latest position in this regard. In their reply, the Department stated :

“The Council has agreed in principle that this centre may be taken up by the ICAR as a Training Centre for Rice Processing in Southern India. Further the ICAR has constituted an Expert Team which visited the Centre to take first hand stock of the activities including mandate assets liabilities etc of the Centre. Report covering various aspects of Paddy processing Centre Thanjavur has been prepared by the Expert Team. This request has been discussed in the Internal Meeting held on 31.1.2001 under the Chairmanship of Secretary DARE & Director General ICAR. As per the decision taken in the said meeting, the letter has been sent to the Secretary, Deptt. of Food Processing Industries. seeking his concurrence for taking over this centre by the ICAR. A reminder has again been sent on 21.3.2001 and the Agriculture Engineering Division has kept provision of funds to take over the Centre as soon as the green signal is received from the Deptt. of Food Processing.”

Makhana

1.89 Makhana is an aquatic fruit crop grown widely in ponds, lakes and ditches in stagnating water. In English it is known as Gorgen nut and belongs to the family Nymphaeaceae and its botanical name is *Eurale feron*. It is a native of South East Asia and China. In India it is cultivated in ponds, lakes and ditches in Bihar, Assam. West Bengal in abundance and to some extent in Tripura, Manipur and Uttar Pradesh. In Bihar it is grown in Darbhanga Motihari Madhubani, Saharsa, Sitamarhi, Katihar, Purnea and Champaran districts.

Makhana is a fruit which is consumed as vegetable. A total of 16 genotypes/ cultivars including local varieties available have been reported.

It is mainly grown in Bihar. It is an important source of livelihood of Mallah (Fisherman) community. It is consumed as dry fruit after processing. It has an export

potential. Though the crop has vast potential for internal as well as external market its productivity is quite low. There is no scientific method for processing makhana seeds. There is no systematic research programme on this crop except a few ad-hoc research scheme supported by ICAR.

Since it is an unexploited/ minor vegetable crop its exact area and production figures are not available. However Bihar produces 75% of the total requirement of Makhana in the country. The percent contribution by different states to the total production of Makhana in the country in Bihar = 75%; Bengal = 10%; Assam = 7%; U.P. = 5%; M.P. = 3%

Makhana is a nutritive fruit and contains Carbohydrates = 76.9%; Proteins = 9.7%; Fat = 0.1%; Mineral = 1.3%; Water = 12.0%;

If it is taken raw in small quantities daily, it helps in reducing blood pressure and heart ailments.”

1.90 When asked about the functioning and infrastructural facilities of the New Initiatives namely (a) NRC-Makhana; (b) NRC – Litchi ; (c) NRC-Pomegranate; and (d) Tech.Mission on Horticulture- NEH Region, the Department stated as under :

New initiatives at (b) and (c) have not taken off.

They are likely to start functioning during 2001-2002. The proposed infrastructure facilities are

1. NRC for Pomegranate	
1. Equipment	15.00 lakhs
2. Works	40.00 lakhs
3. Land & Development	30.00lakhs
4. Vehicles	5.00lakhs
Manpower	
1. Scientific	14
2. Technical	21
3. Addmn.	11

4. Supporting	28
2. NRC for Makhana	
1. Equipment	47.00
2. Works	10.00
3. Land & Development	30.00
4. Vehicles	5.00
Manpower	
1. Scientific	14
2. Technical	21
3. Addmn.	11
4. Supporting	28
3. NRC for Litchi	
1. Equipment	15.00
2. Works	40.00
3. Land & Development	30.00
4. Vehicles	5.00
Manpower	
1. Scientific	14
2. Technical	21
3. Addmn.	11
4. Supporting	28

NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT(NRM)

1.91 The Committee observed that the BE, RE, Anticipated Expenditure, Shortfall for 2000-01 and BE2001-02 for some of the schemes under NRM programme differed from those given in the Scrutiny Document. The factual figures given by the Department are as under :-

Sl. No.	Schemes	IX Plan Outlay	BE 2000-01	RE 2000-01	Short fall/ Excess	Anticipated Expenditure	% Exp. to IX Plan Outlay	BE 2001-02	Date of issue of IX Plan sanction
1.	NBSSLUP. Nagpur	1400.00	256.00	346.00	(+)90.00	346.00	81.00	495.79	29.9.99
2.	CSWCRTI. Dehradun	1200.00	273.00	203.00	(-)70.00	203.00	62.88	576.40	13.10.99
3.	AICRP Tillage	340.00	120.00	103.00	(-)17.00	103.00	89.3	66.00	11.2.2201

4.	CSSRI. Karnal	625.00	138.00	138.00	0.00	138.00	70.54	190.03	23.9.99
5.	WTCER.Bhubaneswar	700.00	220.00	200.00	(-)20.00	200.00	77.45	75.38	9.3.2000
6.	AICRP Water anagement	1250.00	316.00	290.00	(-)26.00	290.00	85.1	319.97	to be issued
7.	CRIDA. Hyderabad	600.00	85.00	126.00	(+)41.00	126.00	85.32	400.13	13.10.99
8.	CAZRI. Jodhpur	800.00	175.00	125.00	(-)50.00	125.00	73.13	510.038	2.9.99
9.	PDCSR. Modipuram	784.69	148.00	83.00	(-)65.00	83.00	69.65	64.90	15.3.2001
10.	AICRP Dryland	1490.00	360.00	360.00	0.00	360.00	83.08	346.17	15.10.99
11.	AICRP Agroforestry	935.00	198.00	252.00	(+)54.00	252.00	86.15	164.45	24.7.2000
12.	ICAR RC.. Barapani	1430.00	445.00	337.00	(-)108.00	337.00	93.02	658.90	24.9.99
13.	<u>New initiative</u> ICAR RC for Eastern Region	600.00	234.00	14.00	(-)220.00	14.00	2.3	500.50	9.2.2001

1.92 The Committee asked about the reasons for much more higher allocations as BE 2001-02 over BE 2000-01 and even higher than anticipated expenditure under schemes at Sl. No. 1,2,4,7,8,12 and 13 mentioned above. In their reply, the Department stated :

“The Institute at Sl.No.1,2,4,7,8 & 12 are old Institutes and they needed more allocation under the Catch-up grant. which was meant for replacement of old equipments & renovation of old building. Therefore higher allocation were made in the BE 2001-2002 and for these Institute. Regarding Sl.No.13 the IX Plan sanction for establishment of ICAR Research Complex for Eastern Region was issued on 9.2.2001 and total allocation for this Institute is Rs.600 lakhs. As most of the expenditure are likely to be incurred next year. therefore higher allocation in the BE 2001-2002 has been made.”

1.93 When asked about the justification for fixing lower BE 2001-02 than the BE 2000-01 and even lower than the anticipated expenditure under schemes at Sl. No. 3.5.9 and 11 mentioned above, the Department clarified :

“As lesser allocation were made during the BE 2001-2002. the units which required catch-up grant were given higher allocations and consequently lesser allocations remained available for Sl.No.3.5.9 & 11. However. the position will be reviewed at the RE stage and depending upon there performance and their requirement. more money can be allocated to these units.”

1.94 Regarding the justification for very unsatisfactory percentage expenditure to IX Plan Outlay under each of the 13 schemes mentioned above, the Department stated :

“The percentage expenditure has been worked out on the basis of actual IX Plan allocations and . the same may kindly be seen in the above table. It may be seen the percentage expenditure is highly satisfactory.”

1.95 The Committee wanted to know about findings/remedial measures envisaged by the Central Arid Zone Research Institute and Central Research Institute for Dryland Agriculture to tackle the problems of the Rann of Kutch region owing to lethal effects of an imported plant from Australia called “*Prosipus Junifera* (Ganda Babool) that has become a killer of natural flora; and creating other terrible problems by damaging the whole ecology of that region. The Department in their reply stated :

“Yes. Sir. it is true that *Prosopis juliflora* has spread aggressively in the wastelands of Kachch region. This is an invasive species and has smothering effect on the plants growing under its canopy.

Central Arid Zone Research Institute. Jodhpur; Central Soil Salinity Research Institute Karnal and NRC on Agroforestry Jhansi has done considerable research work on the efficient management of this species. The findings have shown that proper management and scientific pruning of the plant can help to make it a useful plant resource. The plant

provides useful fuelwood/ coal and can grow under adverse edaphic conditions. Early lopping of the tree converts it into a shrub and its canopy spreads horizontally thus seriously affecting the undergrowth. Efforts are also being made for genetic improvement of this tree species and finding out alternatively species which can grow and provide economic yield under similar conditions.”

1.96 Asked whether any action plan has been drawn up to deal with the grave crisis in Rajasthan and to give relief to farmers with providing timely solutions to their problems in Rajasthan, the Department replied :

“CAZRI Jodhpur and other related institutes in the region have developed several useful and adoptable technologies for management of the natural resources and improved productivity in Rajasthan. The important among these include control of desertification and stabilisation of the sandunes plantation of shelter belts to check wind erosion renovation and improvement of the khadines nadis and tankas recharge of groundwater through percolation tanks roof tops constructed catchment and inter plot water harvesting. Technologies have also been developed for efficient water management and control of salinity and waterlogging in the irrigated areas suitable design of drip and sprinkler irrigation watershed management for the rainfed areas irrigation with saline and poor quality water and associated nutrient management for improved water use efficiency. Improvement of the important field crops fruit crops tree species and extraction of the economic plant products from these resources has provided several economic avenue to the farmers of Rajasthan. The areas which are not suitable for agriculture may be developed through alternate land use system such as silvi-pastoral shortage system. agro-forestry and agri horticulture and ley farming which can provide sustenance to a large

livestock population in the region. The technologies generated at these research institutes are effectively transferred to the farmers through operational research projects. institute village linkage programme. Krishi Vigyan Kendras and non governmental organisations. The institute has also developed an action plan for alleviation and management of drought in the region which has been widely distributed to the user departments.”

Project for Edible Bamboo

1.97 The Committee noted that the Department in their Action Taken reply to the Recommendation Sl. No. 15 of the Seventh Report (1999-2000) regarding initiating an AICRP on Edible Bamboos in NEH region has stated that a Network Project will be proposed by the Director NRC-Agroforestry and Project Coordinator AICRP Agroforestry at different centers in the NEH Region and wanted to know about the concrete steps/action taken to implement the Network Project on Edible Bamboos so far by the Department. In their reply, the Department stated :

“Director NRC Agroforestry and Project Coordinator AICRP Agroforestry convened a meeting at ICAR Research Complex for N.E.H Region. to discuss and formulate the projects on edible bomboos. All the six Joint Directors located in different states of the North East Region have been asked to submit the proposal to the Director and then forward the same to the Council for their possible funding. A status report on edible bomboos in the N.E.H Region is also under preparation. Basic research on the somatic embryogenesis and its exploitation for the production of somatic embryo coupled with artificial seed production was also proposed. It was proposed to standardise food preservation techniques for various products of bamboos like. Chutney, syrup, slices etc.

Dr. Solanki also suggested that possible collaboration with China or other countries may be included in the Network Project.”

AGRICULTURE ENGINEERING

1.98 The BE, RE shortfall, anticipated exp. etc. for 2000-01 and BE 2001-02 under some schemes of Agricultural Engineering are as under :-

(Rs. in lakhs)							
Sl. No.	Scheme	BE 2000-01	RE	Shortfall	Anti.Exp.	%age Exp. to 9 th Plan outlay	BE 2001-02
1	Central Instt. of Agri. Engg.	330.00	260.00	70.00	371.79	48.89	297.00
2	Central Instt. for Post Harvest Engg. And Tech.	320.00	250.00	70.00	276.35	60.86	450.00
3	Central Instt. for Res. on Cotton Tech.	200.00	185.00	15.00	200.00	55.50	200.00
4	Indian Lac Res. Instt.	115.00	90.00	25.00	115.00	27.01	120.00
5	National Instt. of Res. on Jute and Allied Fibre	138.00	120.00	18.00	138.00	31.39	170.00
6	Engg. Measures for Efficient Land and Water Management	40.00	20.00	20.00	12.00	40.00	55.00

1.99 The fund utilization in respect of 6 Institutes and AICRP during the first four years of the IXth Plan as furnished by the Department is as follows :-

(Rs. in lakhs)						
S.No.	Name of Institute/AICRP	Total allocation for 9th Plan	Actual Expenditure during 1st 3 years of 9th Plan	Likely expenditure during 4th year of 9 th Plan	Total expenditure during 1st 4 years of 9th Plan	
1.	Central Institute of Agricultural Engineering	1200	701.95	260.00	961.95	
2.	Central Institute for Post Harvest Engg. & Technology	1163	490.14	250.00	740.14	
3.	Central Institute for Research on Cotton Technology	700.00	581.92	185.00	766.92	
4.	Indian Lac Research Institute	456.00	255.16	90.00	345.16	
5.	National Institute of Research on Jute & Allied Fibres	541.74	274.04	120.00	394.04	
6.	AICRP on Engg. Measures for Efficient Land & Water Management & other programmes	202.46	Nil	Nil	Nil	

By the end of 4th year of IXth Plan the expenditure in respect of the following Institutes will be as under :

- a) CIAE. Bhopal - 80.16 %
- b) CIPHET. Ludhiana - 63.64 %
- c) CIRCOT. Mumbai - 109.56%
- d) NIRJAFT. Kolkota - 72.74 %
- e) ILRI. Ranchi - 75.69 %

f) **AICRP on Engineering Measures for Efficient Land & Water Management** has been approved only recently and formal sanction is still in the process of issues. Hence, there will be no expenditure under this scheme during the 1st four years of the 9th Plan. The project will be started only in the 5th year of 9th Plan. provision of Rs. 202.46 lakhs was not only for this new AICRP but provision has also been made for the expenditure on a new centre on Paddy processing at Thanjaur, likely to be transferred to Agril. Engg. SMD of ICAR during 2001-2002. The expenditure in the 1st four years in respect of CIPHET Ludhiana is only 63.64% as against about 75 to 80% owing to the fact that this Institute is comparatively a new Institute and most of the Scientific and other positions remained vacant during the 1st three years of the project. It is only in the 4th year that the regular Director and a number of scientists have joined and the activities have picked up. It is expected that the remaining amount of the approved EFC for the 9th Plan, major portion of which consists of expenditure on construction of office and residential buildings and purchase of equipment will be utilized

during the 5th year of the 9th Plan. Action has already been initiated for full utilization of balance funds during the last year of the Plan.

The expenditure in the 1st four years of the 9th Plan in respect of CIRCOT, Mumbai has reached to 109.56% owing to the fact that at the time of the EFC, their allocation were reduced in anticipation of their getting Rs. 5 crore as additional Catch Up Grant for the renovation of buildings and replacement of equipment. Since they could not get this extra funds the expenditure for the 1st four years have shot up to 109.56%. Revised EFC has been submitted by the Institute for the approval of the competent authority.”

1.100 The Committee wanted to know the basis of fixing the BE 2001-02 at a very higher side well over and above the BE and Anticipated Exp. of 2000-2001 for schemes at Sl. No. 2,5 and 6 mentioned in the table above. In their reply, the Department stated :

“BE 2001-02 provided to the above six Institutes and AICRP on Engineering Measures for Efficient land and water management (as shown in the table on page 289 of the proposal of ICAR/DARE of the subject) are not on higher side(except in case of CIPHET, Ludhiana) but are on par with the current years allocations. Provision for BE 2001-02. in respect of CIPHET, Ludhiana has been made on a higher side. specifically for the construction of new buildings and purchase of laboratory equipment. which could not be properly utilized in the 1st three years of 9th plan. ”

1.101 The Committee also asked about the reasons for under utilization of funds during 2000-01 under schemes at Sl. No. 2 and 6 above. The Department in their reply stated as follows :-

“The allocation of funds for Agril. Engg. SMD for BE 2000-01 was Rs.24 crores. which was reduced to Rs.20.75 crore at RE stage due to the cut imposed on the overall

allocation of Plan funds to the ICAR at RE stage. Due to this reduction, the allocation to Engg. SMD at RE stage was made as Rs. 20.75 crores as against the B.E. of Rs. 24.00 crores. In view of the reduced allocation for RE. allocations of different Institutes and AICRPs were also reduced accordingly to accommodate within the funds allocated. The RE budget of CIPHET, Ludhiana for 2000-01 is Rs.250 lakhs and it is expected that the Institute would be able to fully utilize the funds during the current year. As regards. the utilization of funds under AICRP on Engg. Measures for Efficient Land and Water Management is concerned. since the formal sanction is still in the process of issue. hence the question of under utilization does not arise.”

1.102 The Committee further enquired whether the post-harvest losses of cereals, pulses and oilseeds were upto Rs. 21500 crore during 2000-01 which was about five and a half times of the total plan and non-plan allocations (Rs. 3893.45 crores) for the entire Ministry of Agriculture consisting four Departments for 2001-02 and efforts made by the Department to reduce these losses to the farmers as well as the nation. The Department in their reply stated:

“It is true that the estimated Post Harvest losses of cereal, pulses & oilseeds would be of the order of Rs.21,500 crore during 2000-01. However, this high loss is not due to the absence of technology, but is due to the lack of application of improved post harvest technologies at farmer's/mandi and Processor's levels. ICAR and other R&D organisations have developed many technologies for proper harvesting, threshing, handling/transport, drying, cleaning and storage of grains which can considerably reduce the Post harvest losses. These technologies need to be popularised by the extension agencies in a mission mode programme amongst the end users.”

ANIMAL SCIENCE

1.103 BE, RE, shortfall etc. for 2000-01 and BE 2001-02 for some of the schemes under Animal Science sector are as under :-

(Rs. in lakhs)							
Sl. No.	Scheme	BE 2000-01	RE	Shortfall	Anti.Exp.	%age exp. To 9 th Plan outlay	BE 2001-02
1	National Dairy Res. Instt.	600.00	550.00	50.00	1000.68	32.92	600.00
2	Central Sheep and Wool Res. Instt.	275.00	200.00	75.00	782.78	44.64	280.00
3	National Instt. of Animal Nutrition and Physiology	300.00	280.00	20.00	488.22	40.94	400.00
4	NRC-Camel	150.00	120.00	30.00	164.18	35.76	175.00
5	AICRP-Sheep	60.00	60.00	0.00	40.00	56.78	65.00
6	AICRP-Goat	75.00	75.00	0.00	50.00	38.72	80.00
7	NRC-Meat & Meat Production Tech.	100.00	30.00	70.00	91.94	5.62	170.00
8	Indian Vet. Res. Instt.	700.00	659.00	41.00	817.00	38.13	700.00
9	PD-Disease Monitoring and Surveillance	250.00	135.00	115.00	347.17	39.27	245.00
10	New Initiatives Network on Rumen Dynamics	40.00		40.00		0.00	0.00
11	Network on Blue Tongue (BT) Disease	0.00	-	0.00	30.00	0.00	55.00

1.104 The Committee asked for the reasons for extremely poor funds utilization during first four years of 9th Plan under each of the schemes mentioned above.

“Due to late clearance of EFC and non-recurring utilization including ban on recruitment and vehicles.”

1.105 The Committee asked about the reasons for a steep increase in anticipated expenditure under each of the schemes at Sl. No. 1.2.3. 8 & 9 mentioned above In their reply, the Department stated :

“The committed expenditure proposed to be undertaken on approved items/programmes could not be undertaken. Hence. the anticipated expenditure is as indicated at Sl.No. 1. 2. 3. 8 & 9 mentioned above.”

1.106 The Committee enquired about the reasons of non-utilization of funds at Sl. No. 10 in spite of an allocation of Rs. 40.00 lakh and reasons for not making any BE provisions for 2001-2002 In their reply, the Department stated :

“The programmes at Sl.No. 10 has been withdrawn.”

1.107 The Committee also wanted to know the reasons for Rs. 0.00 allocation under scheme at Sl. No. 11 and anticipated expenditure as Rs. 30.00 lakh which shows lack of planning and foresight. The Department replied :

“Network programme on Blue tongue has been sanctioned just recently in later part of 2000-2001. Therefore, there is no question of any anticipated expenditure. B.E. 2001-2002 for the programme has been made keeping in view the importance of the programme.”

1.108 It is observed that under IVRI, BE for 2000-2001 is Rs. 880.00 lakhs in Annual Plan Document but in Scrutiny of DFG Document it is Rs. 700.00 lakhs. The Committee enquired about the adequacy of the BE 2001-02 at Rs. 700.00. In their reply, the Department stated :

“Due to over-all cut in Annual Plan allocation for Animal Sciences. the allocation has been reduced for IVRI. But in RE 2000-2001 Rs. 740 Lakhs has been allocated instead of BE of Rs. 700 Lakhs. Though BE for 2001-2002 has been shown as Rs. 700 Lakhs. keeping in view the present allocation made to Animal Science which will be increased subject to the availability of more funds being allocated to Animal Science Division.”

FISHERIES

1.109 The Committee observed the financial data relating to some of the schemes under Fisheries Sector as under :-

(Rs. in lakhs)								
Sl. No.	Schemes	BE 2000-01	RE	Shortfall	Ant.Exp.	%age Exp. to 9 th Plan Outlay	BE 2001-02	
1	Central Marine Fisheries Res. Instt.	450.00	407.00	43.00	478.00	62.61	341.88	
2	Central Inland Capture Fisheries Res. Instt.	415.00	390.00	25.00	415.00	65.52	213.68	
3	Central Instt. for Freshwater Aquaculture	203.00	237.00	+34.00	458.00	62.96	256.41	
4	Central Instt. of	275.00	237.00	38.00	277.81	54.08	299.15	

	Brackishwater Aquaculture						
5	NRC-Cold Water Fisheries	181.00	167.00	14.00	200.65	35.29	299.15
6	Central Instt. of Fisheries Tech.	502.00	324.00	178.00	502.00	39.25	512.82
7	Central Instt. of Fisheries Education	553.00	458.00	95.00	700.00	45.68	726.50

1.110 The Committee desired to know the rationale of fixing BE 2001-02 much lower than the anticipated exp. 2000-01 under schemes at Sl. No. 1.2 and 3 mentioned above. The Department in their reply stated as under :

“Based on the actual expenditure during the current financial year, the RE-2000-01 has been fixed for the three Plan Schemes referred above .

Institutes	IX Plan Allocation	Utilisation during First 3 years	RE 2000-01	BE 2001-02	Total during IX Plan
1	2	3	4	5	6
CMFRI	1708.40	1081.97	407.00	341.88	1830.85
CICFRI	1241.60	610.00	390.00	213.68	1213.68
CIFA	1095.00	725.00	237.00	256.41	1218.41

From the table presented above the total utilisation during the IX Plan in respect of these three Plan Schemes is much higher than their total allocation during the Current Plan Period except in case of CICFRI. The allocations during the next financial year that is BE-2001-02 to the Fisheries Research Sector stands at Rs. 3.000 lakhs which is much lower than the anticipated requirements by the Fisheries Division. Accordingly. The allocation to each Plan Scheme was pruned down for next financial year to accommodate eight fisheries research institutes. one ORP and an Externally Aided Project as a soft loan.”

1.111 In this connection the Committee enquired about the reasons for dismal percentage utilization of funds during first four years of 9th Plan under each scheme mentioned above. In their reply, the Department explained as under :

“The actual utilisation by the Fisheries Division during the first four years of the Current Plan Period is to the tune of Rs. 8400 lakhs with an allocation of Rs. 3000 lakhs for the next financial year which is also the terminal year of the Current Plan Period. Thus, the total utilisation during the current Plan period for the Fisheries Division tentatively stands at Rs. 11400 lakhs against the allocation of Rs. 12384 lakhs. The low percentage of utilisation especially in respect of CIFT, Cochin and CIFE. Mumbai is because :

- (i) An amount of Rs. 900 lakhs out of the total allocation of Rs. 1999 lakhs to CIFT is for acquiring a sophisticated research vessel as a common infrastructure for the Fisheries Division. Due to administrative and cumbersome procedural formalities the activity could not be initiated during the first four years of the current Plan period. However, all the formalities have been completed and the activity would be initiated in the next financial year.
- (ii) An amount of Rs. 1580 lakhs of the total amount allocated to CIFE during the current plan period, that is Rs. 2925 lakh, pertains to the civil activities for establishing permanent university complex for CIFE at Mumbai. Due to administrative reasons the construction activities could not be initiated pending clearances from the Planning Commission and the Ministry of Finance. Hence the expenditure could not be incurred on this activity during the first four years of the current Plan period. However, the item has since been cleared **in principle** from the concerned Department/Ministry and would be initiated during the next financial year.

Hence the utilisation under these two Plan schemes during the first four years of the current Plan period was not up to the expectations.”

AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS AND ECONOMICS

1.112 The Committee noted the Financial data for two schemes under Agricultural Statistics and Economics as given below and enquired about the reasons for very poor funds utilization under both the schemes during first four years of 9th Plan:-

(Rs. in lakhs)							
Sl. No.	Scheme	BE 2000-01	RE	Shortfall	Ant. Exp.	%age Exp. to 9 th Plan outlay	BE 2001-02
1	Indian Agricultural Stat. Res. Instt.	150.00	62.22	87.78	52.24	43.19	285.37
2	NRC-Agricultural Eco. & Policy Res.	250.00	66.50	183.50	103.65	49.11	114.43

In their reply, the Department stated :

“NCAP's BE and expenditure for first 4 years under IX Plan is given below.

	BE (Rs lakh)	Expenditure (Rs. lakh)
1997-98	51.25	51.25
1998-99	60.00	57.53
1999-2000	186.00	185.23
2000-2001	250.00	66.50

The first 3 years show satisfactory performance of expenditure. During 2000-01. there has been poor performance due to following reasons:

- i) Of Rs. 250 lakh. BE for the year, Rs. 135 lakh was allocated for payment of second instalment of construction work. Since there was no progress in construction work even after payment of First instalment during 1999-2000. Second instalment was not paid to CPWD this year.
- ii) Rs. 20 lakh allotted for HRD training (abroad) could not be spent due to Council's restrictions on foreign visits during the year.

iii) Rs. 10 lakh allotted for equipments could not be spent since approval from the Council was not received for this head.

iv) Rs. 15 lakh earmarked for the posts to be filled in during the plan period could not be spent since Ministry of Finance did not approve the proposal though Council had recommended the proposal.

IASRI

	BE (Rs.lakh)	Expenditure (Rs. lakh)
1997-98	147.0	146.96
1998-99	140.0	139.90
1999-2000	104.5	104.43
2000-2001	150.0	52.24

As mentioned above performance of expenditure during first 3 year of 9th Plan was satisfactory. The reasons for poor performance in 2000-01 are given below.

- (i) The estimates for International Guest House is under process.
- (ii) RE 2000-01 has been prepared after taking into consideration the total outlay approved by EFC minus the expenditure already incurred during first 3 years of the IX Plan. Incidentally, the Director, IASRI has informed that the BE for 2000-2001 is only Rs. 56.22 lakh as per the EFC memo which was approved in May, 2000. As such the BE for 2000- 2001 may be treated as Rs.56.22 lakh and not Rs. 150 lakh as mentioned in the plan documents. During this year, they have surrendered Rs. 30 lakh because of delay in the approval of the construction of International Guest House for the Institute.

1.113 The Committee further enquired about reasons for fixing BE 2001-02 at Rs. 285.37 lakh in spite of Anticipated Exp. for the scheme at Sl. No. 1 being only Rs. 52.24 lakhs for the year 2000-2001. The Department in their reply stated :

“Since a balance of Rs. 154.0 lakh is left for utilization during 2001-02 out of the total approved outlay by EFC during IX Plan. BE 2001-02 has now been kept at that level.”

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION

1.114 The BE, RE, shortfall etc. for 2000-2001 and BE 2001-02 under two schemes of Agricultural Extension Sector are as under :

(Rs. in lakhs)							
Sl. No.	Scheme	BE 2000-01	RE	Shortfall	Ant. Exp.	%age exp. To 9 th Plan outlay	BE 2001-02
1	Integrated Krishi Vigyan Kendras	5773.57	5750.05	23.52	5773.57	62.04	6424.02
2	NRC for Women in Agriculture	226.43	9195	134.48	226.43	29.65	439.24
3	Institution Village Linkage programme	--	--	--	--	--	150.00
4	Estt. of new KVKs/TTCs	--	--	--	--	--	1986.74

1.115 The Committee wanted to know about the delay in implementation of new initiatives mentioned at Sl. No. 3 & 4. In their reply, the Department stated :

“The Institution Village Linkage Programme (IVLP). was launched during 1995 with the financial support under AP cess fund in 42 centres of ICAR and SAU. The scheme is now implemented in 70 centres with the financial support under NATP from 1998-99. The proposal for establishment 66 new KVKs and two TTC have been approved in its 17th meeting of EFC held on 13.2.2001.”

1.116 In this connection, the Committee also enquired about the reasons for poor percentage of expenditure under schemes at Sl. No. 1 and 2 above. The Department in their reply stated :

“The BE, RE, shortfall etc. for 2000-2001 and BE 2001-02 under two schemes of Agricultural Extension Sector are as under:

(Rs. In lacs)								
Sl. No.	Scheme	BE 2000-2001	RE	Shortfall	Ant. Exp.	%age exp. To 9 th Plan outlay	BE 2001-02	
1	Integrated Krishi Vigyan Kendras	5773.57	5750.05	23.52*	5750.05	95.96	6574.02	
2	NRC for Women in Agriculture	226.43	91.95	134.48**	91.95	45.26	439.24	
3	Institution Village Linkage Programme	-	-	-	-	-	-	
4	Estt. Of new KVKs/TTCS	-	-	-	-	-	1986.74	
	TOTAL	6000.00	5842.00	158.00	5842.00	94.77	9000.00	

“ The shortfall is because the construction of building in the NRC for Women in Agriculture could not be taken up as the issues of legal transfer of land is pending with Govt. of Orissa and reduction of overall budget of the Council at RE stage.

The overall percentage of expenditure the first four years of IX Plan is Rs.94.77 out of total outlay of Rs.21200.00 lakhs. The outlay for IX Plan has been revised to 29090.32 lacs including Rs.28500.00 lakhs for the KVKs including establishment of new KVKs/TTC. The shortfall in expenditure for the current financial years is due to reduction of budget at RE stage due to overall reduction in plan budget of ICAR. The construction of building for the NRCWA could not be taken up as the legal transfer of land from the Govt. of Orissa is pending in spite of intense persuasion.”

1.117 The Committee in order to review the working of KVKs during the IXth Plan have asked for certain information and the Department furnished it as under :

KVKs during IX plan (1997-2002)							
Sl. No.	Working of KVK	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02 (anticipated)	Remarks (if any)
1	Total No. of KVKs	261	261	261	261	327	In addition 53 ZARS have been strengthen to take up the additional function of KVK during 1998-99 and 1999-2000
2	No. of Fully functional KVKs.	195	207	219	224	257	

3	No. of partially functional KVKs	56	48	38	33	4	
4.	No. of Non-functioning KVKs	10	6	4	4	-	Out of 4 non-functional KVK one has been made functional
5	%age of fully functional KVKs to total	71.08	79.31	83.00	85.82	98.47	
6	%age of partially functional KVKs to total	21.45	18.39	14.56	12.64	1.53	
7	%age of non-functioning KVKs to total	7.47	2.30	1.54	1.54	-	
8	No. of KVKs run by Govt. Instt.	187	190	190	190		
9	No. of KVKs run by NGOs	74	71	71	71	71	Two KVKs transferred to SAUs and one to ICAR Institute
10	Funds allocated (actual) (Rs. in Lakhs)	4417.13	4658.81	5038.73	5750.05	6574.02	The anticipated expenditure shall be 100%
11	Funds utilised (Rs. in lakhs)	4417.13	4658.81	5038.73	5750.05	6574.02	
12	%age of utilization	100	100	100	100	-	
13	No. of States/Uts covered under KVKs	29	29	29	29	-	66 new KVKs and 2 TTC have been approved by EFC during 2001-02 including 25 for North Eastern region

AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

1.118 The following are the financial figures for some of the schemes of Agricultural Education Sector :-

Sl. No.	Schemes	(Rs. in lakhs)					BE (2000-01)
		BE 2000-01	RE	Shortfall	Ant.Exp.	%age Exp. to 9 th Plan Plan outlay	
1	National Academy for Agr. Res. Management	160.00	133.00	27.00	160.00	49.05	190.00
2	Devp. and Strengthening of State Agri. Univ.	2350.00	2040.00	310.00	2350.00	86.76	1228.00
3	Devp. and strengthening of Agri. Edu. Of Central Univ.	75.00	75.00	0.00	75.00	42.00	116.84
4	Estab. of Centres of Advance Studies in SAUs and DUs	300.00	175.00	125.00	300.00	55.75	205.81
5	Estab. of Agri. Univ. at Jammu	250.00	25.00	225.00	250.00	8.50	0.00
6	Support to Agri. Colleges	100.00	10.00	90.00	100.00	2.50	120.00
7	Rural Awareness Work Experience Prog.	100.00	25.00	75.00	100.00	6.25	122.00
8	One time catch up grant	1500.00	1575.00	+75.00	1500.00	388.89	4902.80
9	Agri. Edu. Media Centre	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

1.119 The Committee enquired about the reasons for very low percentage Expenditure to IX Plan outlay under each of the schemes at Sl. No. 1.3 and 4 above and reasons for extremely poor

percentage Expenditure in schemes at Sl. No. 5,6 and 7 mentioned above. In their reply, the Department stated :

“The funds have been released according to the absorbing capacity of the State Agricultural Universities in respect of S.No. 3, S.No. 6 is a new establishment and cut in the overall Budget allocation under RE. It is yet to be cleared. S.No. 7 has been sanctioned only in 2000-01. S.No. 7 yet to start.

The provisions were made to start 5 new Centres under the Centres of Advance Studies (CAS) scheme during the year 2000-01. Since the recommendations of QRT report are under submission to competent authority in the Council the decision about the discipline and place for new CAS could not be taken.”

1.120 In regard to one time catch up grant ,the Department was asked to explain how the percentage expenditure comes to 388.89% to IX Plan outlay for scheme. In their reply, the Department stated :

“The expenditure is high because of investments on capital e.g. renovation. modernisation/ other construction.”

1.121 The Committee wanted to know why BE 2001-02 was fixed very less than the BE 2000-01 under schemes at Sl. No. 2 and 4 above and reasons for `Nil` BE 2001-02 under schemes at 5 and 9 above. The Department stated as under :

“We had demanded Rs.3.800.00 lakh for S.No. 2. However. due to financial constraints the allocation was curtailed. S.No. 9 has not been cleared by the Planning Commission.”

1.122 To a query whether SFC document has been cleared for Agricultural Education Media Centre. The Department stated that “The Planning Commission has rejected the proposal for

its public funding.”

MANAGEMENT AND INFORMATION SERVICES

1.123 The financial data under MIS is given in the following statement :-

(Rs. in lakhs)								
Sl. No.	Sector	BE 2000-01	RE	Shortfall	Anticipated Expenditure	%age to 9 th Plan outlay	BE 2001-02	9 th Plan outlay (1997-02)
1.	Management & Info. Services	2555.00	771.00	1784.00	1169.31	72.45	1000.41	7436.00
(1 a)	Pipeline Projects	0.00*	242.28	+242.28	*	3.43	*	7054.84

1.123(a) Asked about the details of various schemes and break of funds allocated to them, the Department in their reply stated :-

“A statement showing allocation of Rs.771.00 lakhs for various components of MIS for the year 2000-2001 and proposed outlay of Rs.1424.70 lakhs for the year 2001-2002 are given below :

NAME OF THE SCHEME	Location	Estt. Year	ANNUAL PLAN 1999-2000	IX PLAN 1997-2002	ANNUAL PLAN 2000-2001		Annual Plan 2001-02
			Actual Exp.	Approved Outlay	Approved Outlay	Anticipated Expenditure	Proposed
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
MANAGEMENT AND INFORMATION SERVICES							
1. Civil Works							
a. National Agricultural Science Center. Pusa	New Delhi	1995	475.00	2650.00	500.00 (a+b)	100.00	400.00
b. Krishi Anusandhan Bhavan – Phase-II	New Delhi	1995	337.24	976.00		200.00	50.00

c. Land at DWMR. Patna	Patna		25.36	0.00	-	0.00	0.00
2. Publication and Information	New Delhi		69.99	571.51	150.00	70.00	100.00
3 ICAR Headquarters	New Delhi						
a. Modernisation of Office Space and Facility	New Delhi	1994-95	27.17	442.45	80.00	54.00	70.00
b. ICAR Library	New Delhi	1996-97	0.00	88.74	30.00	30.00	18.00
c. Publicity and Public Relation	New Delhi	1997	2.92	74.71	20.00	50.00	30.00
d. Agricultural Scientists Recruitment Board	New Delhi	1994-95	3.24	150.00	50.00	17.00	57.00
e. Intellectual Property Rights (IPR)	New Delhi	1998	-	40.00	15.00	15.00	15.00
f. Golden Jubilee	New Delhi	1997-98	1.57	62.48	0.00	0.00	0.00
g. Strengthening of ICAR Headquarters	New Delhi	1997-98	9.99	636.01	60.00	20.00	37.41
4. Support to Professional Societies including NAAS	New Delhi	1992-93	134.52	650.00	185.00	180.00	163.00
5. Department of Agricultural Research & Education	New Delhi	1997-98	28.30	250.00	60.00	35.00	60.00
TOTAL:			1115.30	6591.90	1150.00	771.00	1000.41

1.124 The Committee wanted to know reasons for very low anticipated expenditure under Sl. No. 1 during 2000-2001 and also the reasons for about 27% less utilization of funds during the IX Plan so far To these points, the Department stated :

“The original allocation for MIS in the BE 2000-2001 excluding pipeline project was Rs.1150.00 lakhs.. Against this, the anticipated requirements were shown as Rs.1169.31 lakhs in respect of MIS excluding pipeline projects which in fact is more than the original BE 2000-2001 for MIS excluding pipeline schemes. The anticipated expenditure of Rs.1169.03 lakhs did not include allocation for pipeline schemes and therefore the anticipated expenditure of Rs.1169.03 lakhs for MIS should be seen with reference to the original allocation of Rs.1150.00 lakhs in the BE 2000-2001 for MIS.”

1.125 When asked about the reasons for keeping the BE 2001-02 Rs. 1000.41 lakh much lower than BE 2000-01 of Rs. 2555.00 lakhs. The Department stated :

“The allocation in the BE 2001-2002 for MIS is Rs.1000.41 lakhs including pipeline projects. The low allocation of Rs.1000.41 lakhs in the BE 2001-2002 as compared to BE 2000-2001 for MIS is on account of drastic reduction in the total Plan Outlay approved by the Planning Commission. In fact, the sanctioned BE 2001-2002 for MIS is insufficient to meet its overall budgetary requirements.”

1.126 As regards pipeline projects, the Department clarified as under :-

“In fact, a sum of Rs.1379.00 lakhs was kept for pipeline projects in the BE 2000- 2001 as projected in Annual Plan 2001-02 document which was subsequently reduced due to cut in budget at RE to Rs. 242.28 lakhs. As explained above the budget allocated to MIS is insufficient even to meet its essential requirements. The outlay of pipeline projects through typographical error has been reflected in BE of MIS in Scrutiny of Demands for Grants document. Since no time is left for unexpected pipeline projects to utilize funds during the current financial year requirement has not been reflected.”

1.127 The Committee also sought details about the pipeline projects, their commissioning schedule, cause of abandoning any of these projects etc. along with the justification for blocking of Rs. 7054.84 lakh under pipeline projects for five years with nil expenditure. In their reply, the Department stated :

“This pipeline money is kept for unexpected exigencies/projects such as outbreak of disease and pests, natural calamities like earthquake, cyclone, droughts, floods, reflectable components for externally aided projects etc. Due to sever cut in outlay at RE stage, every year funds tentatively kept under pipeline are utilized for these eventualities. Since the funds are reallocated for these exigencies and extra needs of ongoing scheme, the expenditure is showing in concerned activities.”

WORLD BANK PROJECTS (WBPs)

1.128 The BE, RE, Anticipated Expenditure etc. for some of the schemes under WBPs are as under :-

(Rs. in lakhs)								
Sl. No	Schemes	BE 2000-01	RE	Short-fall	Ant.Exp.	9 th Plan outlay	%age Exp. to 9 th Plan outlay	BE 2001-02
1	National Agri. Tech. Project(NATP)	13400.00	1200.00	1400.00	20000.00	58855.37	42.97	14517.23
2	Agri. Human Resources Devp. (WB)	1200.00	806.00	394.00	1030.00	4140.70	316.43	110.68

1.129 The Committee enquired about the reasons for under-utilisation (anticipated) of Rs.170crores under AHRD project and also as to how percentage expenditure during 9th Plan worked out to 316.43% in reply to these points, the Department clarified as under:

- “ (i) (a) Due to non-finalization of amendment for funds / slots in the overseas training component for extended period of the project. the expenditure of Rs.400.00 lakh could not be made.
- (b) Due to non completion of formalities as per the World Bank procedure. the balance 20% payment on account of office equipment items the expenditure could not be made.
- (c) Provision made for funds of Rs. 300.00 lakh for procurement of Video Conferencing facilities in the KAB II could not be utilized due to non-completion of building.
- (ii) Actually it is 68.85 per cent and not 316.43 per cent as a calculation lapse.

1.130 The Committee wanted to know the details about NATP with regard to financial targets, Physical and Scientific/Technical targets fixed and achieved; under each of its component. year-wise since its inception reasons for shortfall if any, above and remedial measures taken to make up the shortfall The Department in their written reply stated :

(a) The following details are given about National Agricultural Technology Project

Year	Component	Targets as per EFC Allocation	BE	Allocation RE	PIU Expenditure and Releases	Shortfall
1997-98						
	O&M				11.03	
	Research				1.47	
	TD				-	
	Price Contingency					
	Total					12.50
1998-99						
	O&M	55.76	42.46	35.48	35.47	20.29
	Research	31.57	25.28	6.50	3.48	28.09
	TD	20.17	1.09	3.02	3.03	17.14
	Price Contingency	1.28	-			1.28
Total	108.78	68.75	45.00	41.98	66.80	
1999-2000						
	O&M	68.34	38.50	13.65	13.67	54.67
	Research	72.46	63.50	62.03	62.01	10.45
	TD	25.86	10.00	13.32	13.32	12.54
	Price Contingency	6.91	-			6.91
	Total	173.57	113.00	89.00	89.00	84.57
2000-01						
	O&M	34.31	9.74	10.95	3.06	31.25
	Research	109.72	109.76	90.05	113.41	- 3.69
	TD	32.10	14.50	19.00	10.47	21.63
	Price Contingency	15.84	-	-		15.84
	Total	191.97	134.00	120.00	126.94	65.03
2001-02	O&M	17.42				
	Research	113.83				
	TD	35.18				
	Price Contingency	23.83				
	Total	190.26	145.00			

Justification for Shortfall : Expenditure was incurred as per Allocation / RE

(b & c) Physical/Scientific/Technical targets

i.) O&M Component

S.No.	Activities	Status / Achievements
1.	Institutionalization of priority setting, monitoring, evaluation	Several national and regional sensitization-cum-training workshops were organised in different parts of the country for prioritization of research and impact assessment. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A task force has been established for Priority setting, monitoring & evaluation (PME).• Monitoring indicators for different levels have been developed• Monitoring & evaluation system for projects has been developed.• The Project Information Management System (PIMS) has also been developed.

ii.) Research

	Selection of research proposals	A good progress has been made; the research proposals are approved by SAP/RPC/ PMC as per set procedures evolved for NATP. The number of projects approved under different modes are as follows:				
		Mode	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	Total
		Team of Excellence (TOE)	5	17	5	27
		Mission Mode (MM)	1	17	20	38
		Competitive Grant (CGP)	-	1	90	91
		Production System (PSR)	-	96	151	247
		IVLP	-	44	26	70
		Total	6	175	292	473

(iii) Innovation in Technology Dissemination (ITD) Component (ICAR)

1.	Under the ICAR component of the Innovations in Technology Dissemination, 53 Zonal Research Stations (ZRS) remanded to function as KVKs have been identified. These ZRSs are being strengthened to serve their newly assigned roles of developing and testing location specific technologies.
2.	Forty Agricultural Technology Information Centres (ATICs) have been established for providing single window support system linking the various units of research institutions in ICAR (15) and SAUs(25).
3.	In addition, 29 Directorates of Extension Education in SAUs and 8 Zonal Coordinating Units are being strengthened. Investments worth Rs. 62.17 crore under various sub-components of ITD (ICAR) for five years have been approved.

iii) (d) Major Constraints / suggestions

1. Though the Project Agreement was signed on 22 June 1998. the clearance of EFC was issued on 15 Dec 1998. the major activities were actually could be initiated during 1999-2000.
2. The allocation of funds is included with the Plan budget of ICAR. Hence the budget for this time bound NATP project is not allocated as per the EFC provision. The project activities therefore have to be curtailed within the allocated budget.
3. The general circulars /guidelines /instructions with regard to ban on purchase of vehicles and creation/recruitment of staff is hampering the implementation of the Project. Such an economic austerity measures may not be put on this project. being funded by the World Bank. ”

PART II

CHAPTER II

Recommendations / Observations

Recommendation No.1

Agricultural Research and Education to get 1% of AGDP

The Committee note that the Department of Agricultural Research and Education was initially given an approved IX th Plan Outlay of Rs.2653.22 crore which included Rs.400.00 crore as a one time catch up grant. Later on, although this initial allocation of Rs.2635.22 crore was revised to Rs.3376.95 crore by the Planning Commission for the entire IXth Plan, yet the DARE/ICAR has been allocated only Rs.2749.39 crore as Budget Estimates (BE) in five years which have been further reduced to Rs.2514.17 crore at Revised Estimate (RE) stage. Rs.684.00 crore has been added for 2001-2002 in the total five years actual REs of Rs.2514.17 crore. Rs.2514.17 crore is Rs.121.05 crore less than Rs.2635.22 crore initially envisaged for DARE and Rs.862.05 crore less than the revised enhanced allocation of Rs.3376.95 crore for the entire IXth Plan.

The Committee also note that the Central Government as a whole, actually have raised their total IXth Five years' Plan allocations to Rs.548061.90 crore from the earlier IX Plan (Five years') approved allocations of Rs.489361.00 crore. In spite of, this steep increase in the central plan allocations, there is a steep decrease in the DARE/ICAR plan allocations even from the actually committed plan allocations by the Planning Commission and the Ministry of Finance in their favour.

The Green Revolution, the White Revolution and the Blue Revolutions India have been bestowed upon after her independence could be possible mainly because of the research work and adoption of technologies developed by the dedicated efforts of the Scientist engaged in agriculture and its allied sectors.

The Government has set a target of achieving 4% annual growth in agriculture and allied sector during the X Plan from the financial year 2002-03, contrary to the annual growth of 0.9% in 2000-01 and 0.7% in 1999-2000 in agriculture and allied sector. The Committee feel that this 4% annual growth target during the Xth Plan can be achieved by giving special provisions to the pressing needs of the Research and Educational activities of the apex Department/Institutes viz DARE/ICAR. Imposing drastic financial cuts at RE stage or even later in the financial year leads to dislocation of programmes and annual plan targets as is evident from the Financial Statements of the Department in each year of the IXth Plan period.

The Committee, therefore, once again, strongly recommend that present level of about 0.20% budgetary allocations made to DARE/ICAR of the Agricultural Gross Domestic Product (AGDP) is hardly sufficient and should be increased to the level of at least 1% of AGDP with a tendency of gradual increase upto 2% of AGDP in Xth Plan onwards as has been happening in the economically and agriculturally developed nations of the world. This enhanced priority financial support to DARE/ICAR will not only help the nation to achieve the targeted 4% growth rate envisaged for agricultural and allied sector but also help the Indian farmers to compete and withstand the forced freedom of

agrarian imports in the wake of WTO agreement for total removal of Quantitative Restrictions (QRs) for importing many agrarian produces into India.

Recommendation No. 2

Inadequate Plan Budgetary Allocations to DARE/ ICAR for the year 2001-2002

The Committee observe that the DARE/ICAR proposed the plan outlay of Rs.1497.90 crore for the Annual Plan 2001-02. But, the Planning Commission / Ministry of Finance has provided only Rs.684.00 crore as Budget Estimates (BE). It is also observed that this proposed amount of Rs.1497.90 crore is the remaining balance amount out of Rs.3376.95 crore meant for the entire IXth plan period to carry out the planned activities of DARE/ICAR since in the first four years of the IXth Plan only Rs.1830.17 crore could actually be provided to the Department.

The Committee strongly deplore this tendency of Planning Commission and the Ministry of Finance for a very rigid and mechanical type of providing plan budgetary allocations to DARE/ICAR year after year as is evident from the Budget Estimates provided during 1998-99 (Rs.531.17 crore); 1999-2000(Rs.573.50 crore); 2000-01 (Rs.629.55 crore); 2001-02 (Rs.684.00 crore). All through these years not even minimum 10% to 12 % inflationary trend has been considered while providing budgetary allocations to the Department. This year the budgetary support of Central, State and UTs has recorded an increase of 16% over RE 2000-2001 but the DARE has again been left out, this shows the Government's low priority to Agricultural Research over other sectors of the economy. The Committee strongly opine that to meet the challenges of the present and the future times, the Government has to reprioritize the role of Agricultural Research in its books of budgetary support and allocate much more public funding to the Department rather than mere annual increase of 7 to 9 % in BE for their plan activities.

The Committee, therefore, strongly recommend that the Department should be provided with Rs.1497.90 crore by the Planning Commission and the Ministry of Finance during the year 2001-02 as required by them since many of their new initiatives and other programmes are badly suffering owing to lack of optimum funding. The Committee further recommend that no financial cuts should be imposed on the Department at RE stage, as any financial cuts imposed now may lead to further addition of miseries to Indian farmers and people engaged in agricultural and allied sectors, in the absence of timely help in terms of research and extension activities of the Department.

Recommendation No.3

Parliament is Supreme in Financial Matters of the Centre

The Committee note that year after year Planning Commission and the Ministry of Finance are grossly engaged in imposing drastic financial cuts onto the plan schemes of the DARE/ICAR at Revised Estimates stage in the name of financial constraints.

The Committee are well aware, that, the only reason why the Central Government every year present the detailed Expenditure Budget etc. of the entire spectrum of Government's Ministries/ Departments to the Parliament for consideration and passing of the General Budget, is because of the Supremacy of Parliament in all financial matters of the Executive as has been guaranteed by the Constitution of India in the present system of Parliamentary Democracy.

The Committee, are of the opinion that the General Budget is nothing but detailed account of public money the Central Government has been able to gather and promises to spend during the financial year through various Ministries/Departments of the Centre and State Governments through the various schemes/projects these Ministries/Departments are engaged in for the multi-dimensional welfare and ultimate and overall safety, security and socio-economic growth of every citizen of India. Therefore, once it has been passed by the Parliament in favour of all the Ministries/Departments mentioned therein, the Planning Commission and the Ministry of Finance has no constitutional powers over and above the powers of the Parliament to make major modifications or imposing severe cuts on the passed Budgetary Estimates of various Ministries/Departments later in the year without taking Parliament into confidence.

The Committee regret on the state of affairs and desire that the Planning Commission and the Ministry of Finance should not take the recommendations of the Committee lightly. Expressing grief the Committee point out that every year they assemble, deliberate and disperse without having any impact on the Planning Commission or the Ministry of Finance.

The Committee strongly condemn this attitude of the Planning Commission and the Ministry of Finance which in practice has made them more powerful than the whole Parliament and has eroded the actual Supremacy of the Parliament which is the essence of the Parliamentary Democratic system of the Government, as in this system, will of the representatives, democratically chosen by the people, is Supreme for all the purposes of governing the people.

The Committee, therefore, strongly recommend that the Ministry of Finance and Planning Commission should provide Budgetary allocations of DARE/ICAR more rationally and put an end to choking the pace of activities of the Department by reducing their Budgetary allocations at the Revised Estimates stage every year under various new and ongoing schemes/ projects already approved by the Planning Commission and the Ministry of Finance. This will not only help the Department perform better for the nation and save the Ministry of Finance and Planning Commission from backing out from their own financial commitments made in favour of the Department but also, above all, restore the Supremacy of the Parliament.

Recommendation No.4

Overall Review of Plan Allocations vis-à-vis Non Plan Allocations during VIIIth and IXth Plan

The Committee have made a critical study of the allocations of Plan and Non Plan funds to the DARE/ICAR from the year 1992-93 till date.

They observe that from 1992-93 to 1998-99 the Budgetary allocation (BE) on Plan allocation have been above 50% and the Non-Plan allocations below 50% of the total allocations. However, from the financial years 1999-2000 onwards the BE Plan Funds have declined below 50% and the Non-Plan allocations have risen above 50%.

On a further scrutiny the Committee note that at the RE stage the Plan Funds have been below 50% and Non Plan funds above 50% and at one stage the Plan Funds went down to 39% and Non Plan to went upto 61%.

The Committee are aware that ICAR has approx. 5500 scientists, in 47 Central Institutes, 4 National Bureaux, 10 Project Directorates, 28 National Research Centres, 82 AICRPs and one Central Agricultural University etc. In other words it is a very big family. Agriculture is contributing 27% of the Agricultural GDP and DARE/ICAR is getting 0.23% of the GDP as allocations. Out of the meager 0.23% allocation over 60% is eaten up by Non-Plan activities.

The Committee are very concerned with the decreasing trend of Plan allocation. Although the effects of Research are seen in many fields of production through genetic improvement, but it is hovering around little gains and losses in the various activities. The Committee, therefore, recommend that an independent body of agricultural and scientific

experts should be constituted by DARE/ICAR to evaluate in some means by setting certain parameters to evaluate the worth of the research conducted compared with the non-plan expenditure incurred on each scientist conducting that research. This body should also take up the state of the infrastructure available for research and the level of satisfaction of the scientists etc. i.e., human resources, while giving its findings.

The Committee hope that such an evaluation would be available to the Committee by the next financial budget.

Recommendation No.5

One Time Catch Up Grant

The Committee note that the Department had been proposing an allocation of Rs.100.00 crore, Rs.200.00 crore and Rs.250.00 crore in their Budget Estimates for the years 1998-99, 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 respectively towards the total one time catch up grant of Rs.500.00 crore considered essential for modernization of the decades old National Agricultural Research System as per the recommendation of the 9th Plan Working Group as well as the recommendation of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Agriculture made year after year in favour of this grant.

The Committee also note that actually the Planning Commission and the Ministry of Finance has earlier agreed for Rs.400.00 crore towards this grant for the entire IX Plan period against the originally envisaged grant of Rs.500.00 crore. This year (2001-02) there is no separate proposal made by the Department for this grant in their Budget Estimates due to the fact that the Planning Commission desires that requirement of different projects/programmes should include one time catch up grant and that no separate allocation will be made for catch up grant. In view of the negative attitude of the Planning Commission for providing one time catch up grant separately, the Department allowed different projects/ divisions to utilize 20% of catch up grant during 1999-2000 and 30% during 2000-01 and remaining 50% will be allowed to be spent on catch up requirement depending on the fund availability with different institutions.

The Committee are astonished to note that although, under the advice of the Planning Commission the Department has allowed different divisions to use 20% of their

total annual allocations during 1999-2000 and 30% during 2000-01 as one time catch up grant yet the total BEs of the Department pertaining to the year 1999-2000 and 2000-01 at Rs.573.50 and Rs.629.55 crore respectively do not reflect any addition/merger of 20% over and above the BE of Rs.573.50 crore for 1998-99 nor any 30% addition/merger in 2000-01 over the BE of 1999-2000 as only marginal increase of 7 to 8% in the BEs of these years is visible which hardly covers the annual inflationary increase of the projects/schemes running cost.

The Committee, therefore, once again strongly recommend that the Planning Commission and the Ministry of Finance should release the one time catch up grant of Rs.500.00 crore as per their commitment by providing Rs.200.00 crore during 2001-02 and remaining amount of Rs.300.00 crore during the year 2002-03.

Recommendation No.6

100% Funding for Schemes in North East

The Committee had recommended and reiterated in their 19th Report (1998-99) and 7th Report (1999-2000) respectively that all the schemes planned for the North East Region by the Department should be 100% funded by the Union Government.

The Committee note that the Department have been giving various different and self –contradictory statements ever since the Committee had initially recommended in this regard in their 19th Report. In the Action Taken reply to the 19th Report on DFG (1999-2000), the Department in July, 1999 had stated that the recommendation of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Agriculture in this regard “is being forwarded to the Planning Commission and the Ministry of Finance for policy decision and for providing consequential budgetary increase in the current budget.” Further, in their Action Taken reply to the 7th Report on DFG (2000-01) in July 2000, the Department had stated that “All schemes of the Department were being implemented in the North Eastern States and Sikkim, are funded on 100% basis except the AICRPs and their centers located in Assam Agricultural University.” And , when examining the DFG 2001-02 pertaining to the Department, the Committee enquired about the outcome of the policy decision taken by the Planning Commission and the Ministry of Finance regarding 100% funding issue, the Department gave another version by stating that “the Department from the very beginning provides 100% funds to all its schemes except AICRP Centres irrespective of the location of the scheme... For 100% funding of the Central Agricultural University, Imphal the Department has already submitted proposal to the Planning Commission for Rs.40.00

crore from Non-lapsable Central Pool of Resources and apart from this the funding of 25 new KVKs worth Rs.4.93 crore during IX Plan in North East Region will also be pursued in the light of EFC decision on KVKs from Central Pool after clearance of EFC from Ministry of Finance.”

The Committee could not understand the reasons for ambiguous and misleading replies by the Department in this regard as in their opinion there was no point in saying that the matter was being forwarded for policy decision to the Planning Commission and the Ministry of Finance while the Department from the very beginning is following the policy of providing 100% funds to all its schemes **“except the AICRPs and their centres located in Assam Agricultural University”** and later on after a year, changing to another version **“except AICRP centres irrespective of the location of the scheme.”**

The Committee, therefore, strongly deplore this attitude of the Department in giving ambiguous and contradictory statements year after year which grossly amounts to misleading the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Agriculture and advice the Department to give correct and clear statements based on truth to the Committee henceforth.

The Committee further recommend that the Department should put in vigorous efforts to get the EFC clearance from the Ministry of Finance with regard to funding of Rs.4.93 crore to 25 new KVKs in North Eastern Region and Rs.40.00 crore funding to Central Agricultural University, Imphal from Non-lapsable Central Pool of Resources on priority basis so that the Department can get respective allocations at the RE stage this year and work should actually start under both the schemes within this financial year.

Recommendation No.7

Disposal of Pending / Fresh Vigilance and Disciplinary Cases

The Committee have been recommending from July 1998 onwards in their Reports for quicker disposal of pending as well as fresh vigilance/ Disciplinary cases arising in the DARE/ICAR within a stipulated time frame of 2 years and since handling of such cases is a continuous process there should be a separate and full-fledged Vigilance Cell headed by the Director (Vigilance).

The Committee note that in pursuance of the Committees' recommendation in this regard, the Department has been taking some steps such as circulating the instructions/guidelines issued by CVC on 3.3.99 and 6.9.99 in the ICAR vide Circular dated 10.3.2000 regarding laying down an elaborate model time for completing departmental enquiries and for reducing delays in the Departmental inquiries. Thus, the Department took about a full year in simply circulating the instructions/guidelines issued by CVC for information, guidance and compliance in DARE/ICAR institutes.

The Committee also noted that (a) the "Handbook on Disciplinary Matters" 1983 edition, has been got updated and its draft is under examination for finalisation and circulation to all concerned in the Department; (b) two retired officers from the panel have been selected and entrusted with the work of enquiry since most of the personnel or scientists are not well conversant with the procedures of vigilance nor they are oriented towards this work; (c) during last one year 5 vigilance cases and 7 disciplinary cases have been disposed off leaving the balance of 20 pending Vigilance cases and 21 Disciplinary cases; (d) 8 fresh Vigilance cases are likely to be charge sheeted and 9 fresh Disciplinary

cases have been initiated during 2000-01; (e) the ICAR has 5500 scientists in place and the percentage of Vigilance cases is hardly 20 (twenty) per cent; (f) a separate proposal has been mooted for creation of the post of Joint Secretary (Vigilance) and is under active consideration.

The Committee are hardly satisfied with the outcome of the efforts made by the Department to quicken the disposal of pending/fresh Vigilance/ Disciplinary cases emanating in the Department, and further observe that it clearly shows the lack of seriousness on the part of the Department since it took the Department full one year for circulating the instructions/guidelines issued by the CVC for compliance within the Department. Similarly, the revision and circulation of “Handbook on Disciplinary Matters” could not be completed during last one year and is still pending. Such delays clearly indicate that the Department is having a lackadaisical approach towards this entire issue. The Committee, therefore, strongly recommend that henceforth immediate and prompt action (preferably within a fortnight) should be taken in the matters of circulating instructions/guidelines issued by CVC for information and compliance by all concerned.

The Committee also take a serious view of this extra-ordinary high percentage of personnel viz. 20% (twenty per cent) found to be engaged in some form of malpractices / corrupt practices and are booked under Vigilance cases. The Committee are of the opinion that sheer lack of seriousness on the part of the Department in handling the pending Vigilance/Disciplinary cases expeditiously and strictly is the main reason why less number of cases are disposed of and more number of cases are added to the list during every year. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Department should bring in a

qualitative and positive change in their attitude in handling Vigilance/Disciplinary cases strictly and expeditiously and the full-fledged Vigilance Cell headed by Director / Joint Secretary (Vigilance) should start functioning within the year 2001-02 in the Department.

Recommendation No.8

Functioning of Agricultural Scientists Recruitment Board (ASRB)

The Committee noted that normally 8 to 9 months are required by the ASRB for filling up of the vacancies/recruitment of Senior Scientists and technical posts of the ICAR Headquarters and Institutes. But some times ASRB has taken more time for filling up of these posts due to the involvement of ASRB on other direct recruitment examination of Administrative and Accounts posts such as ARS/NET/SRF, Administrative Officers/Section Officers/Assistants/LDCs/ Finance and Accounts Officers etc.

The Committee are of the opinion that optimum utilization of Internet/Computer in recruitment procedures of the scientist and other technical personnel for the ICAR can be of great help and can considerably reduce the usual 8 to 9 months time.

The Committee, therefore, emphatically recommend that the ASRB should start giving their advertisement for recruitment on Internet apart from their usual practice of advertising through DAVP. Likewise, ASRB should also evolve a procedure to receive responses to their advertisement through / on Internet at a designated site address as this will not only eliminate the time-lag in receiving applications due to postal delays and lost-in-transit of genuine responses but also enhance the quality and quantity of responses to the ultimate advantage of the ICAR and the nation. Furthermore, the advantages of computers can also be put to use for screening etc. of applicants. The Committee feel that if the Department adheres to these suggestions of the Committee the recruitment of Scientists/technical personnel should not take more than 4 to 6 months instead of 8 to 9 months taken up till now.

The Committee are also inclined to recommend that ASRB should have a separate cell to deal with non-scientific posts.

Recommendation No.9

Need to exclude Externally Aided Projects (EAPs) funding from BE of DARE/ICAR

The Committee note that Rs.638.97 crore has been allocated for Externally Aided Projects (EAPs) / World Bank Projects for the entire IX Plan against the total IX Plan outlay of Rs.3376.95 crore, thus leaving only Rs.2737.98 crore as Domestic Budgetary Support (DBS) However, due to arbitrary financial cuts imposed onto the Department every year at the RE stage, the Department could not do justice to the EAPs/ WBPs since it could only actually spent Rs.300.27 crore during the first four years of the IX Plan against the approved outlay of Rs.367.46 crore for the same period.

The Committee are of the opinion that since External Aid is for certain purposes and objectives that are different from the regular schemes of the ICAR and are strictly time bound programmes involving the Collaborating and Donor agency for the very specific cause/purpose, it should have no link with the Domestic Budgetary Support of the Department and the domestic programmes of ICAR. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Planning Commission and Ministry of Finance should immediately decide in favour of excluding the EAPs/WBPs component from the Plan Budgetary Estimates (BEs) of the Department and should provide EAPs allocations separately over and above the BEs meant for the Department from the current financial year onwards,

i.e., in the year 2001-02 itself and the Department should be provided with Rs.155.00 crore meant for EAPs/WBPs over and above the BEs of Rs.684.00 crore.

Recommendation No.10

10% allocations to NE States on DBS Basis

The Committee note that since 1998 all the Ministries/Departments of the Government have to allocate minimum 10% funding of their Gross total Plan Budgetary Allocation to the schemes exclusive meant for the benefit of the NE states and Sikkim as per the policy decision of the Central Government.

The Committee also note that Externally Aided Projects/ World Bank Projects are usually area-cum-need based specific programmes and funds need to be spent under the mutually agreed programmes under which there seems to be very little scope for diverting the EAP/WBP funds to the programmes to the regions other than those agreed upon between the donor agency and DARE/ICAR. The Department has made several requests to the Planning Commission and Ministry of Finance to allow them to allocate 10% on the basis of Domestic Budgetary Support (DBS) only rather than on the basis of Gross Budgetary Support (GBS) so that the approved programmes could be implemented with full thrust and the funds requirement of EAPs could also be met. The Parliamentary Standing Committee on Agriculture has also requested the Government through their recommendations in their Reports to exclude EAPs funding from the 10% NE States allocations.

The Committee learn that the Budgetary Support constitutes DBS + EAP and therefore 10% to North Eastern States of Budgetary Support will include a 10% cut from the EAP also. In their opinion this is simply deplorable. The Committee would advise

the Planning Commission to resort to sound financial practices rather than resort to arm twisting.

The Committee, therefore, once again reiterate their earlier recommendation with regard to 10% allocations to NE States and Sikkim on DBS basis excluding EAP.

Recommendation No.11

Ambiguity in Budget Heads/Sectors' Nomenclature depicted in Expenditure Budget Vs Other Budgetary Documents of the Department

The Committee have observed that there have been certain ambiguities/variations both in Budget Heads as well as in nomenclature of various sectors and allocations made thereto relating to Demands for Grants as depicted in Expenditure Budget (EB), Government of India Document in comparison with various relevant budgetary documents containing financial statements such as (i) Annual Plan, (AP), (ii) Scrutiny of Demands for Grants (SDFG), (iii) Performance Budget (PB). For example, the Budget Heads , (i) “Crop Husbandry and other programmes” (ii) “Soil and Water Conservation.” (iii) “Animal Husbandry”; (iv) “Dairy Development”; (v) “Fisheries”; and (vi) “Forestry”, and their respective allocations as BEs and REs as reflected in EB, GOI neither can be matched from the angle of nomenclature of the Budget Heads / Sectors Heads nor can be matched straightaway from the angle of their respective allocations if compared with Budget Heads / Sector Heads and their respective allocations depicted in SDFG, AP, and PB. This makes the whole scrutiny work of Demands for Grants of the Department difficult and complex.

The Committee also note that on their repeated recommendations, the Department have been trying to get these Budget Heads amended from MOF/CGA since 1997, but has not succeeded so far.

The Committee, therefore, once again strongly recommend that the Department should get all these ambiguities of Budget Heads/ Sector Heads and their respective

allocations under Plan and Non-Plan, BEs and REs, removed and bring the desirable clarity and uniformity in these matters in all the Budgetary Documents of the Department.

The Committee also request MOF/CGA in giving their full support to the Department to resolve this issue of ambiguity in Budget Heads within this year so that the desirable clarity is reflected in the next Demands for Grants.

Recommendation No :12

“Anticipated Expenditure” by the Department for 2000-2001

The Committee note that Budget Estimates (Plan) 2000-01 were Rs.629.55 crore while the Revised Estimates (Plan) were brought down to Rs.550.00 crore. Nevertheless, the Annual Plan (2001-02) Document of the Department depicts Anticipated Expenditure of Rs.790.33 crore which happens to be Rs.160.78 crore more than the BE (Plan) and Rs.240.33 crore more than the RE (Plan).

The Committee also note that during evidence two different statements with regard to excess in Anticipated Expenditure during 2000-01 were made. The first statement was about the reasons for increase in the Anticipated Expenditure to the tune of Rs.160.78 crore in the Plan schemes which stated, “Since most of the IXth Plan schemes have been approved and their sanction issued, increase in anticipated expenditure is to purchase approved equipments and also for providing funds for other non recurring contingencies to strengthen the research and educational programmes”. The Second statement was regarding the source of additional funding of Rs.160.78 crore which stated, “ Since there is no source of additional funding of Rs.160.78 crores, activities of many project/programmes may suffer in terms of infrastructural development for want of adequate funds both in current and next financial years.”

The Committee, disapprove of giving inflated figures of Anticipatory Expenditure. The Committee fail to understand as to how an expenditure could be anticipated well knowing that there is no additional source of income beyond Rs.550.00 crores and

recommend that the Department should desist from such practice in future. Anticipatory Expenditure figures should be as close as possible to the actual expenditure likely to be incurred during the year.

**New Delhi;
11th April, 2001
21 Chaitra, 1923 (Saka)**

**S.S.PALANIMANICKAM
Chairman
*Standing Committee on Agriculture***